THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CIII.] JULY, 1853. [Vol. IX.

TARSUS AND ITS IDOLS.*

Cilicia is a region full of interest to the geographer and the historian. The passes of Amanus and Taurus are the gates through which the intercourse of Asia Minor with the civilized countries on the Euphrates and the Tigris must be carried on; and the armies of Europe and Asia have threaded them in turn, according as either was the assailant of the other. Shalmaneser must have penetrated them when, according to Grotefend's reading of the Nimroud obelisk, he conquered Asia Minor. Cyrus rejoiced to find them undefended as he marched into Syria on his way to dethrone his brother. Alexander and Darius encountered each other at Issus. The Crusaders, after the battle of Dorylæum, "climbed with toil and danger the steep and slippery sides of Mount Taurus, where, had not terror preceded their van, the long and trembling file might have been driven down the precipice by a handful of resolute enemies."† And in our own days Ibrahim Pasha passed through the same defiles when, after the conquest of Syria, he was proceeding to possess himself of Constantinople, had not European arms and diplomacy interfered. Cilicia consists of two regions of very distinct character; the Cilicia Aspera of ancient geography—the mountainous district which shuts it in on the west and north-west—and Cilicia Campestris, the fertile plain at the foot of these mountains, through which the rivers Pyramus, Sarus and Cydnus flow to the sea. On the last of these stands Tarsus, one of the most celebrated cities of the ancient world,—claimed by the Greeks as a foundation of Perseus, by the Assyrians of Sardanapalus, and especially interesting to Christians as the birthplace and early residence of St. Paul.

The names of both the authors whose names appear on the title-page of this work, are well known, and are a guarantee of its value. Mr. Barker is the son of the late English Consul at Aleppo and Cairo, whose intelligence and hospitality are acknowledged by every oriental traveller, and he himself has been a

* Lares and Penates, or Cilicia and its Governors; being a short Historical Account of that Province, together with a Description of some Household Gods of the Ancient Cilicians, broken up by them on their Conversion to Christianity. First discovered and brought to this Country by the Author, William Burckhardt Barker, M.R.A.S. Edited by William Francis Ainsworth, F.R.G.S., F.G.S., &c. London—Ingram, Cooke and Co. [Illustrated London Library.]

† Gibbon, XI. 63.

resident for many years in Tarsus in an official capacity. Mr. Ainsworth, the Secretary of the Syro-Egyptian Society, is better acquainted than perhaps any other living Englishman with the geography of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Assyria, which he has described in his Researches in Assyria, Travels in Asia Minor, and Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand. The volume contains a great deal of valuable information respecting the geography, ancient and modern, the natural history and statistics of this little-known region, accompanied by a number of pictorial illustrations. We propose, however, to notice only those parts which have a bearing on biblical criticism and sacred history.

In representing Tarsus as the Tarshish of Scripture, our authors have revived an error which has been long abandoned by historical critics, though countenanced by Josephus (Ant. i. 6). Thus they write, p. 12,

"Scripture historians affirm that the sons of Tarshish, the great grandsons of Noah, who were settled on this coast, had made themselves famous for navigation and commerce; so that ships of Tarshish had become a common appellation for all vessels of trade, and to go to Tarshish, a proverbial expression for setting out to sea in such vessels. In Isaiah xxiii. 10, Tyre is called 'the daughter of Tarshish,' which would lead us to infer that the nautical celebrity to which the Tyrians had attained, had its rise in Cilicia, and that a colony from this country settled on the Syrian coast and laid the foundation for Phœnician grandeur and fame."

They add in a note,

"There are few questions in sacred geography that are involved in greater difficulty than the position of Tarshish or the several Tarshishes mentioned in the Scriptures. One of the latest authorities, the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., has attempted to cut the Gordian knot, by arguing that all the scriptural passages in which the name occurs agree in fixing Tarshish somewhere in or near Spain. But there was another Tarshish in Ophir or Arabia; for in 2 Chron. xx. 36, it is recorded that Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joined himself with Ahaziah, king of Israel, to make ships to go to Tarshish; and they made ships in Ezion-Geber, that is on the Elanitic gulf, on the eastern arm of the Red Sea. And in the parallel passage, 1 Kings xxii. 49, these vessels are described as ships of Tarshish, which were intended to go to Ophir; so there appears much probability that there was a Tarshish nearer to Judæa. An important testimony to this effect occurs in Ezek. xxxviii. 13—'Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, and all the young lions thereof.' Now here Tarshish is mentioned in conjunction with two eastern sites; and the Amanus was in ancient times as renowned for its lions, as Cilicia is to the present day distinguished by the number of its panthers, while it does not appear that there were lions in Andalusia. Again, when Jonah (i. 3, iv. 2) wished to avoid the duty imposed upon him to go and prophesy against Nineveh, he took ship at Joppa and fled to Tarshish. It is not likely that he fled as far as Spain; but it is not unlikely that he fled from Judæa and took refuge in Tarsus."

Now this opinion, that Tarshish was the Tartessus of the Greeks in the south of Spain, and that no other is ever meant in Scripture, which our authors represent as an attempt to cut a Gordian knot, is really the conclusion accepted at the present day by all historical critics. There is no knot to cut, and only an easy one to untie; there would have been none had not they tangled it by a variety of mistakes. In Isaiah xxiii. 10 ("Pass through thy land as a river, O daughter of Tarshish: there is no more strength"), the daughter of Tarshish is not Tyre, but the people of Tartessus; and the concluding words should have been rendered, "there is no more restraint."* The sway of Tyre over her colonies was tyrannical. Her power at home having fallen, her dependencies were free, and like a river, "wandering at its own sweet will," their inhabitants could pass uncontrolled where they pleased. It is not said that Jonah "took ship at Joppa *and fled* to Tarshish," but that he "found a ship going to Tarshish, and went down into it to go with them unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord" (ch. i. 3), and by this more precise statement, ch. iv. 2, "I fled unto Tarshish," must be explained. Under such circumstances, he would evidently endeavour to flee to "the uttermost parts of the sea" (Ps. cxxxix. 9); and therefore Tartessus, the very remotest point of the known world to the west, would naturally suggest itself as the place in which he would be most likely to hide himself from Jehovah. The voyage from the coast of Syria to that of Cilicia was too short and too familiar to furnish the imagination with the thought of escaping from his presence. The true sense and reading of Ezek. xxxviii. 13, is uncertain. Newcome, following the Septuagint and Syriac, renders it "villages," which requires only the transposition of a *jod;* but if the common reading be retained, "young lions" may easily be taken in the sense of "young warriors," as in Nahum ii. 11, and the passage has more force and spirit, if places remote from each other, as Sheba and Dedan from Tartessus, are represented as joining in the taunt. The comparison of 1 Kings xxii. 49, with 2 Chron. xx. 36, creates equal difficulties on either hypothesis; for ships would no more be built at Ezion-Geber to go to Tarsus than to Tartessus. We will print in juxtaposition the two passages, and we think the solution will easily present itself.

1 Kings xxii. 49.	2 Chron. xx. 36.
Jehoshaphat made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold: but they went not; for the ships were broken at Ezion-Geber.	Jehoshaphat joined himself with Ahaziah to make ships to go to Tarshish; and they made ships in Ezion-Geber. And the ships were broken, that they were not able to go to Tarshish.

* See Gesenius and Ewald ad loc.

From the comparison of the two texts, it will be evident that the writer in the Book of Kings uses "ships of Tarshish" in the sense of large ships, equipped for a long and distant trading voyage, such as that to Ophir, which occupied three years (2 Chron. x. 21); whereas the chronicler supposes that they made a voyage *to* Tarshish. So in 1 Kings ix. 28, Solomon is said to have employed the mariners of Tyre to man his ships for a voyage to Ophir; while the chronicler (2 Chron. ix. 20), describes the voyage as being to Tarshish, from the same misapprehension of the phrase, "ships of Tarshish." This is not the only occasion on which we have seen cause to regret that modern travellers in the East follow implicitly our common translation, and are not acquainted with the present state of biblical criticism. The exaggerations and misapprehensions of the writer of the Book of Chronicles, make his authority very doubtful where he differs from his predecessor. That Tarsus and Tarshish are not the same, is evident from the coins of the former city, on which the name of its tutelary deity, Hercules, is written in the Phœnician language, which is identical with the Hebrew, *Baal Tarz.**

Tarsus, however, was truly what St. Paul describes it (Acts xxi. 39), "no obscure city." It was, according to Xenophon (Anab. i. 2), πόλις μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων. "Ye think yourselves," says Dio Chrysostom,† addressing its inhabitants, "flourishing and happy, because ye dwell in a large city and occupy a fertile region, and all things necessary for life are possessed in the greatest abundance among you, and the river flows through the midst of you;‡ and besides this, Tarsus is the metropolis of the Cilician cities." Marcus Antonius, when he administered the province of Asia after the deaths of Brutus and Cassius, had made it free and granted it immunity from taxation.§ Its inhabitants, according to Strabo, were so devoted to philosophy and the whole circle of the sciences, that they surpassed even Alexandria and Athens, though the fame of their schools was not able to attract strangers to Tarsus, as that of the other two cities did. It more commonly happened that the natives, when they had learnt all that could be learnt at home, repaired to foreign schools to complete their studies, and never returned. Rome was full of such literary emigrants from Tarsus and Alexandria.‖

The title-page of this work puts conspicuously forward an

* Gesenius, Mon. Phœn., p. 276. † See Wetstein on Acts xxi. 39.

‡ It was a remarkably cold stream, descending from the mountains at no great distance, and flowing through a deep valley, and had hence nearly proved fatal to Alexander; but it was believed to have great virtues in nervous and gouty complaints. Strabo, xiv. p. 673.

§ Appian Bell. Civil, v. 7.

‖ Winer (Bibl. Wörterb. s. v.) quotes a dissertation by Heumann, De claris Tarsensibus.

account of the discovery of the "Household Gods of the Ancient Cilicians, broken up by them on their Conversion to Christianity." In this annunciation two things are mixed together, resting on very different evidence,—the fact that a number of broken mythological figures in *terra-cotta* have been discovered near Tarsus, and the hypothesis of the author, that they are Cilician household gods, broken up by the converted Tarsensians. Now, as the volume itself contains the opinion of so eminent an antiquary as Mr. Birch, that these terra-cottas are not what the title professes them to be, we think it was hardly fair to allure purchasers by so very positive an annunciation of the supposed discovery. The circumstances under which they were brought to light are curious. Mr. Barker says,

"During a residence of eight years in Cilicia, I was, in the year 1845, at different intervals, presented with one or two of these terra-cotta heads by an Armenian, who passed a great part of the day rummaging among old ruins, which is frequently the case with lazy fellows, who pass for moral men or 'saints' of the modern Eastern population. I had in vain questioned him regarding the place where he had found these objects. He had naturally an interest in avoiding to satisfy my curiosity, as I paid him handsomely for everything he brought me; and he pretended that he used to write magical words on pieces of paper, which he threw up in the air, and then dug in the places where they fell.

"One day, a friend observed the Armenian scratching the earth on the slope of a hill, at no great distance from my residence. He suspected what the man was looking for, and on informing me of the circumstance, I proceeded to the spot, where I discovered the rich mine from which I have drawn the whole of my collection.

"On the ancient wall of Tarsus a hill leaned (if I may be allowed the expression), which must have been many centuries there, inasmuch as on its summit and towards its base there exists a fabric, the foundations of which are of Roman cement, which was used for the interior of walls, and which, petrifying, becomes a conglomeration of mortar and pebbles of different sizes, harder to break up than the rock itself. The inhabitants of the present town carry away, wherever they find them, all the large square stones they require. After using up all that they could find on the surface of the ground, they dug up the foundations of the old city of Tarsus. This foundation is now as low as forty feet under ground, such being the speed with which alluvial deposits accumulate in a country so near the high ridges of the Taurus, and in a city on which several towns have been built in succession. In the course of time, the wall on which the hill leaned was thus carried away, stone by stone, and a *secant* of the hill left exposed to view. In the centre of this secant it was that I first discovered these precious objects. The curiosity excited by this discovery was great, and it was impossible to prevent the inhabitants from crowding to the spot. They were all much pleased with the lamps found among the rubbish; these I could not prevent them carrying off, but they took no interest in anything else (heads being perfectly useless to them), and I have reason to believe that nothing of any consequence escaped me except these lamps, of which, however, I secured a great many."—Pp. 152—154.

The terra-cotta fragments thus brought to light consisted for the most part of heads of the various divinities, whose worship may be supposed to have been long established in a city so thoroughly Hellenized as Tarsus, or more recently introduced by its commercial intercourse with Egypt, or Phœnicia, or Asia Minor. Mr. Barker thinks, from their small size, that they were used in the domestic chapels or *lararia*, in which images of this kind were placed. The title, however, of Lares and Penates, which he has given to his book, is calculated to mislead. They were gods or genii of a peculiar order; and though they were always of a diminutive size, yet the other gods, as Jupiter, Juno, Apollo, Mercury, did not become Lares and Penates merely by being executed on a small scale. Yet this is our author's only reason for calling them Lares and Penates, since they comprehend every god in the latest editions of the Pantheon.

Mr. Abington, of the Hanley potteries, appears to have suggested the idea, which has been eagerly adopted by Mr. Barker, that the occasion of so large and miscellaneous a collection of broken images of the gods being found together is, that the people of Tarsus were converted to Christianity, if not by the preaching of St. Paul, at least of some of his most able and efficient disciples, sent by him in his anxiety for the conversion of his immediate friends and relations. By a sudden and simultaneous movement, the result of this conversion, they emptied their lararia of their terra-cotta idols; and instead of "casting them to the moles and the bats," threw them out into the common receptacle of the potsherds of the city. With this explanation he is himself so well satisfied, that he pronounces it to be "admitted and settled" (p. 173), the only question being when it took place. The coins found among the fragments range from 150 to 200 B.C., while the costume of some of the female figures points to the age of the Cæsars,—Mr. Birch says the late Cæsars,—so that we have a range of nearly three centuries for the accumulation of this heap of fragments. It does not appear to have occurred to Mr. Barker that this alone throws great doubt on his hypothesis of a *sudden* destruction of Lares and Penates, consequent upon conversion to Christianity. He indeed appears to assume that the age of the whole of them must be that of the latest of the coins and the latest of the costumes; but this is not only an arbitrary, but a very improbable assumption. If the Christians really sacrificed their idols on their conversion, they made their sacrifice as cheap as possible; no silver or gold (Is. ii. 20), or even bronze, is found, only clay.

We look in vain, in the New Testament or in Ecclesiastical History, for any indication of such a conversion of the people of Tarsus. Mr. Barker thinks that St. Paul would be especially anxious for the conversion of his townsmen and kinsfolk; but his kinsfolk must have been Jews, and would have no idols in

their houses; and against the presumption that he would be eager to convert his former townsmen, may be placed the fact, that no preaching of the gospel by him or any apostolical missionary in Tarsus, is mentioned in the Book of Acts. Mr. Barker says that St. Paul chose Cilicia as the first scene of his labours, and for several years made this province of Asia Minor the field he most loved to toil in (p. 31). We should have wished for some proof of this, beside the mere mention of his residence at Tarsus. When the Holy Spirit separated him and Barnabas to the work of their mission (Acts xiii. 4), they were at Antioch, in Syria, whence they came down to Seleucia, at the mouth of the Orontes. A short voyage would have carried them across the Bay of Issus to the mouth of the Cydnus; and had St. Paul planted a church in Tarsus, he would surely have desired to visit it, and had an excellent opportunity of doing so. Instead of this, he sails to Cyprus, and goes thence, not to Cilicia, which lay opposite, but to Perga, in Pamphylia, and thence to Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and thence again to Antioch, Attalia, and Antioch on the Orontes, without, as far as appears, visiting a single city within the limits of the proper Cilicia, certainly without any mention of Tarsus. It is true that the Book of Acts speaks of him as "going through Syria and Cilicia, and confirming the churches" in the cities where he and Barnabas had preached the word of the Lord (xv. 36, 41). But when we come to particulars, we find again no mention of any place within the limits of Cilicia; but instead of it, Derbe, Lystra and Iconium. We seem, therefore, to be brought to the conclusion, that Cilicia is here used in a more extended sense for the southern provinces of Asia Minor. The division of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters in our common version, and the insertion of *then* in xvi. 1, make it appear as if the visit to Derbe and Lystra had been subsequent to the visit to Cilicia; but the Greek only says, "He went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches, and came to Derbe and Lystra," which is quite consistent with the idea that these places were included in the general designation of Cilicia. That the name of Cilicia was extended to the countries on the northern and western side of Taurus, so as even to include Lycaonia, is evident from a passage in Strabo (xii. p. 535), in which he says, that "*out of that which had been Cilicia before Archelaus*, the Romans formed an eleventh præfecture [of Cappadocia], namely, the land about Castabala and Cybistra, *as far as Derbe*."

There is an obscure period in the life of St. Paul between the time when the disciples at Jerusalem, after his return from Damascus, sent him forth to Tarsus that he might escape the hostility of the Hellenists (Acts ix. 30), and his recal by Barnabas and his union with the church of Antioch (xi. 26). How was

he employed during this interval of several years (from 38 to 42 A.D.)? In founding churches in Tarsus and elsewhere, in Cilicia and Syria? Such appears to be the common opinion; but in his account of himself (Gal. i. 21), he says nothing of this, simply alleging that his time was past in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, as a proof that he was not in communication with the apostolical authorities at Jerusalem, or in any way acting under them, nor being even personally known to the churches of Judæa. Had he been so employed, is it credible that he should never again have set foot in the scene of his first missionary labours, and that no mention of any church within the limits of Cilicia proper should have been found in the Book of Acts? Difficult as it may be to conceive of the apostle as inactive during so long a time, it is still more difficult to understand how all record and trace of his activity should have disappeared.

We imagine that when he retired from Jerusalem to Tarsus, the time was not fully come for the preaching of *his* gospel; and if in the interval he was not active as a missionary, Providence was actively preparing the way for his future exertions. Till the conversion of Cornelius, the pillars of the church of Jerusalem appear to have had no conception of the full scope of the gospel; and even when Peter returned from Joppa, having witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the devout Gentiles, those of the circumcision contended with him for his infringement of their strict usage in eating with the uncircumcised. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem was short, and we may conclude, less from what he says than from the general tone of his Epistle to the Galatians, that the intercourse between him and Peter was not very cordial. We can hardly conceive that on the great subject of the admission of the Gentiles they could have agreed, or that Paul even then had not fully adopted the views which he afterwards promulgated. The other churches of Judæa were probably in point of liberality not in advance of the leader of the church of Jerusalem. But while he was in retirement at Tarsus, the way was prepared for a great change. The men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who had come to Antioch (Acts xi. 20), had begun to preach to the Gentiles with great success; and the church in Jerusalem, hearing of this, sent Barnabas thither, by whose labours a still further increase took place, and the first community of *Christian* disciples was formed. What could be more natural than that Paul, if he had already become known as the advocate of Gentile privileges, should be sent for from Tarsus to give this cause the aid of his energy and ability? Barnabas accordingly fetched him thence, and they laboured jointly for a year at Antioch, before Paul went up to Jerusalem to carry the alms of the church. When he and Barnabas returned from their first mission, it was news to the church of Antioch that "God had opened

the door of faith to the Gentiles" (Acts xiv. 27). Could this have been the case if the Gentiles of Tarsus had been converted some years before by Paul, and had broken all their idols?

We have been led incidentally to inquire into an obscure part of Paul's history; but if it were admitted that he had planted a church at Tarsus, it would be far from following that the broken terra-cottas are a record of its establishment. We have already seen that they must have been the work of prolonged accumulation; and Mr. Birch has explained the circumstances under which they were deposited, so naturally, and so entirely in accordance with archæological facts, that we cannot hesitate to agree with him. The mound from which Mr. Barker extracted them, is a *monte testaccio*, one of those heaps of broken pottery which are found near the sites of ancient cities, and of which a remarkable example is seen outside the walls of Rome. It consisted not only of the fragments of images of the gods, but of masks, lamps and vases, some of which are still whole. The images of the gods are what the Romans called *sigillaria*, and were set up as votive offerings in the temples, from whence, as they were very liable to be broken, they were cleared out from time to time, and thrown into this general receptacle. Few vases are found among them, but a vast number of lamps, probably not fewer than 3000. As works of art and illustrations of archæology, they possess a very high interest. The clay of which they are formed is remarkably fine, but the mode of manipulation proves that they were coarsely executed by the potter. The designs, however, from which the potter wrought, belong to a very high style of art, shewing exquisite taste and feeling in the designer. The fragments have been restored and set up under the direction of Mr. Abington, of Hanley, whom we have before mentioned; and at a recent sale of Mr. Barker's antiquities, many of them were purchased for the British Museum, which contained previously various specimens of ancient terra-cottas, but none precisely of this kind. They afford a curious proof of the wide diffusion of taste and skill throughout the countries which had been subject to the influence of Greek culture, and may serve to stimulate our countrymen to raise the art of design, as connected with manufactures, out of the barbarous and degraded condition in which it has so long languished. They illustrate the state of religious opinion in the Roman empire at the time when the gospel was preached—the lax toleration of a mixture of foreign superstitions with the traditionary mythology of Greece and Rome, and the corruption of religion by men given up to vile affections and a reprobate mind (Rom. i. 28). Mr. Birch has discovered in them a curious confirmation of Egyptian history. One of the heads is so utterly un-Grecian in its physiognomy, as to suggest the idea that it must represent the native of some barbarous region. On its being shewn to Mr. Birch, he

immediately pointed out its identity in feature with those of the prisoners in a painting of the campaigns of Rameses III., who made war in Asia, and, as we may hence conclude, in Cilicia. The permanence of the national type is remarkable; but Mr. Barker's inference that the fragment is as old as the time of Rameses III., is rather hasty. An antiquary who should discover a fragment of Mr. Wedgwood's pottery with the figure of a chained and kneeling negro, might on the same ground argue that it was of the age of the Pharaohs, on whose monuments similar figures occur.

K.

A LESSON FROM THE ROLLS COURT.

Behold the mind of man! with faculties
To search in space and find the planets out,
And numerate their bright orbs attendant;
Descry their belts, track their elliptic paths,
And comprehend their motions. Yet behold
This mind of man! this high intelligence,
That measures orbits and weighs well the spheres;
Feeble of vision to distinguish Truth,
Or pierce the realms of Time; whose mists among—
Most oft with gold-fraught Interest by her side—
Roams Error in fair mask and glitt'ring garb,
Announcing with loud tones and clarion shrill,
"Lo, I am Truth!" Attracting, oftentimes,
The keen of intellect, in her long train
Of feeble ones, to follow; and oftentimes
The just of purpose are allurëd too:
While Truth remote, undecked, without display
Or noisy trump of proclamation, walks
Unrecognized, or by but few descried,
And but in part her perfect form discerned,
And, midst the din, scarce listened to her lore.

Of spirits equal in their pure intent,
Alike in knowledge and in wit the same,
Alike in long pursuit of verity,—
While some succeed, to find it many fail.
Oh! let it teach the heirs of imperfection,
Opinions, dogmas, and discordant creeds,
With gentleness to hold; nor feel dislike
Because a brother's eye as theirs sees not!
Let the Rolls Court* instruct them well to know
How varied is the human apprehension,
And that the wise, good in their difference,
To kindle hate and wrath permit it not!

Kappa.

---

* See Christian Reformer, May, 1853.

RECENT TRANSLATIONS FROM THE CLASSICS.*

In spite of the disparaging estimate of classical learning so frequently put forth by the advocates of a more material and practical education, translations from the classics continue to issue from the press as abundantly as at any former period. The considerable demand thus indicated would seem to proceed from two classes of readers. The one consists of those younger and less fastidious ones who, finding themselves at school or college expected to prepare daily a page or two of some classical author, seek to diminish the amount of effort to themselves by the use of a translation ready made. For this class of readers, such translations as those which Mr. Bohn is publishing in his "Classical Library" are best adapted and mainly intended. Of these publications, which are of very various merit, the best are those founded on previous translations by scholars of some note, including the classics usually read in schools, as Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, which are readable and generally correct; and among the poets, Homer and the Greek tragedians, with Virgil and Horace. They are, it is true, bald and prosaic enough, but owe to the labours of their first authors the merit of literal correctness. Others of the series translated for Mr. Bohn, bear too much the stamp of trade speculations—units of a publisher's series—got up to order at so much a volume and so many a year. Some of these, as, for instance, the later volumes of Plato, are disfigured by a flagrant disregard of English idiom, and renderings, sometimes false, and often so absurdly bald and literal, as to be intelligible only to those who can re-translate them into the original, and who therefore need no translation at all.

We may be allowed to doubt the utility of publishing translations of this kind and for this purpose; for, as generally used, they rather prevent than assist the development of interpretative skill. We do not, however, go so far as to maintain that all use of translations by students is necessarily mischievous. If in all cases an attempt at translation were honestly made and difficulties fairly grappled with unaided, in such a manner as to call forth the ingenuity and resources of the student,—the translation being only referred to after his own powers have been strengthened by the effort, with a view to confirm or correct the result to which he has himself arrived,—little harm would be done. But the majority of young men have not sufficient self-restraint for this moderate use of them, and we fear they are chiefly valued as enabling the learner to get at the result without having gone

---

* The Lyrical Dramas of Æschylus, from the Greek; translated into English Verse. By John Stuart Blackie. J. W. Parker.

The Odes of Horace; translated into unrhymed Metres, with Introduction and Notes. By F. W. Newman. John Chapman.

through that mental process, or made that mental effort, which is the real object of the task proposed. If so, we think that these cheap translations are likely rather to defeat their professed object, and deteriorate the quality of our scholarship.

There is, however, a better and higher class of translations, made by men of ripe scholarship and literary eminence, and which therefore claim respect as literary productions. They are for the most part undertaken, not for the stipend of a publisher, but from love and admiration felt for the original, and they have often occupied many years of spontaneous labour. They are intended, too, for a higher class of readers. As they seldom profess to be literal, they do not answer the purposes of a crib; their aim is to reproduce in English the form as well as the letter of an ancient author; and accordingly, where the original is poetry, the translation is not, like those previously mentioned, in prose, but assumes a poetical form.

Of this class we have two specimens before us; the Dramas of Æschylus, by Professor Blackie, of Edinburgh, and the Odes of Horace, by Professor Newman, both of them productions of high merit, and worthy additions to our translated classics.

Translations of classical poetry into English verse can of course only approximate the finished beauty of their originals, and must always be on this account unsatisfactory performances. Independent of the inferiority of our language, arising from its looseness and want of inflection, which leads Mr. Newman to compare his attempt to copying a marble statue in soft wood, the mere necessity of expressing certain given ideas, neither more nor less, within a given number of lines and syllables, cannot but impose on the most skilful writer fetters destructive of the grace and spontaneity of the original poet. The one has been happily compared to the swift-footed Achilles, bounding fleet and free along the shore—the other, to one who, in attempting to follow him, should be compelled to place his feet exactly in the foot-prints he had left upon the sand.

The Germans, favoured in the possession of a language at once flexible and strong, have not shrunk from imposing on themselves, in versions from the ancient poets, restrictions which would drive an Englishman to despair. Since Joh. Heinrich Voss translated Homer, line for line, into German hexameters, it has become the received fashion to translate dramatic and lyrical poetry also into the exact metre of the original, and even the complicated measures of the choral odes are scrupulously reproduced. The attempt, however, to introduce the metres of the richly-vocalized classical tongues into the rough and consonantal Teutonic, whose verse is founded on accent more than on quantity, is regarded by many of the Germans themselves as injudicious. So intractable is the English language under such restrictions, that the retention of the exact metres is seldom or

never attempted, and the advisability of employing even rhyme is not established. Professor Blackie, who was once unfavourable to it, now thinks that in lyrical poetry it cannot be dispensed with. Mr. Newman, on the other hand, in his Odes of Horace, discards it altogether, and we think rightly. We doubt whether, in elevated lyric poetry, rhyme adds much to the effect, even in English; at any rate, it does not seem important enough to compensate for the violence which its adoption must inevitably cause to the original. Professor Blackie says, "it is so essential an accompaniment of lyrical language, according to English usage, that a translator is not doing justice to his author who habitually rejects it." But if, in adopting it, he is forced to do still greater injustice by omissions, interpolations and alterations in the sense, this very regard for his author will suggest that it should be dispensed with, and the more, as it is an expedient utterly unknown to the ancient poets of Greece and Rome. We have, too, even in English, many noble passages of almost lyric character in the blank verse of Milton, Thomson, Cowper and others; and the well-known Ode to Evening of Collins, is itself a proof that, to compositions purely lyrical, rhyme is by no means essential. We think, therefore, that Mr. Newman is right in discarding it, and contenting himself with adopting "stanzas of similar tone and feeling and proportionate compass" to those of the original, without attempting to imitate the metres.

The avowed principle upon which both the translations before us are made, is, that they are intended for the unlearned rather than the learned, and hence explanations have been given in the notes of all mythological or antiquarian allusions. Mr. Newman, indeed, goes so far as to say, that he assumes in his reader no classical knowledge whatever beyond the having read Homer in a translation. Small as this amount would be, it may have been well to assume it as a guide in drawing up the notes; but it is likely that the readers of both translators will rather be those who have read Homer and Horace, and Æschylus too, in the original, and whose interest in them will prompt them to read these versions, not so much to see what Æschylus or Horace said, but how far their interpreters have succeeded in reproducing them in English. And we are bound to say of both, that they have not made their assumption any pretext for looseness or carelessness in translating, well knowing that though the unlearned may be among their readers, it is the learned who must be their judges.

The translation of Æschylus, begun, as its author informs us, more than twelve years ago, is prefaced by two very instructive and spirited essays; one on the general requisites of metrical translation, setting forth the views and principles which have guided him in his present task; and the other, on the genius of Greek Tragedy, which, with its constant adjuncts of choral song

and dance, he plausibly declares to be more like what we should call sacred opera than real tragedy. There is also a biography of Æschylus, and an introduction prefixed to each drama, intended to supply the English reader with that preliminary historical or mythological information, and to inspire him with those particular Hellenic views and feelings, requisite for the comprehension and enjoyment of the piece. And at the end notes are added, either explaining the allusions or construction of the original, or justifying the version given of the particular passage. In the translation itself, the serious and lofty ruggedness of the great tragedian is well sustained, and his difficulties of language and construction overcome with the skill of an accomplished scholar and true poet. Notwithstanding his emphatic declaration in favour of rhyme in the lyrical parts, Professor Blackie has not always adopted it; but in long choral passages either judiciously abandoned it, or brought in a rhyme occasionally where it could be done without violence to the sense of the original. A fair specimen of the success with which the lyric portions have been rendered, will be found in the first well-known chorus of the Agamemnon, from which we give a few extracts.

"Nine years have rolled, the tenth is rolling,
Since the strong Atridan pair,
Menelaus and Agamemnon,
Sceptred kings by Jove's high grace,
With a host of sworn alliance,
With a thousand triremes rare,
With a host of strong defiance,
Sailed for Troy. From furious breast
Loud they clanged the peal of battle;
Like the cry of vultures wild
O'er the lone paths fitful wheeling,
With their plumy oarage oaring
Over the nest by the spoiler spoiled,
The nest dispeopled now and bare,
Their long but fruitless care.
But the Gods see it; some Apollo,
Pan or Jove, the wrong hath noted,
Heard the sharp and piercing cry
Of the startled birds, shrill-throated
Tenants of the sky:
And the late chastising Fury,
Sent from above to track the spoiler,
Hovers vengeful nigh.

Thus great Jove, the high protector
Of the hospitable laws,
'Gainst Alexander sends the Atridans,
Harnessed in a woman's cause,
The many-lorded fair.
Toils on toils shall come uncounted
(Jove hath willed it so);

Limb-outwearying hard endeavour,
Where the strong knees press the dust,
Where the spear-shafts split and shiver,
Trojan and Greek shall know.
But things are as they are: the chain
Of Fate doth bind them; sighs are vain;
Tears, libations fruitless flow
To divert from purposed ire
The powers whose altars know no fire."—P. 14.

In the following, from the same chorus, the difficulties of a truly Æschylean passage are skilfully overcome.

"I'll voice the strain. What tho' the arm be weak
That once was strong,
The suasive breath of Heaven-sent mem'ries stirs
The old man's breast with song.
My age hath virtue left
To sing what fateful omens strangely beckoned
The twin kings to the fray,
What time to Troy concentuous marched
The embattled Greek array.
Jove's swooping bird, king of all birds, led on
The kings of the fleet with spear and vengeful hand;
By the wayside, from shining seats serene,
Close by the palace, on the spear-hand seen,
Two eagles flapped the air,
One black, the other silver-tipt behind,
And with keen talons seized a timorous hare,
Whose strength could run no more,
Itself, and the live burden which it bore.
Sing woe and well-a-day. But still
May the good omens shame the ill."—P. 17.

As a sample of the Iambic portion of the same Play, we give the famous passage descriptive of the line of beacons by which the fall of Troy was telegraphed to Argos.

"*Chor.* But how? What stalwart herald ran so fleetly?
Clyt. Hephæstus. He from Ida shot the spark;
And flaming straightway leapt the courier-fire
From height to height; to the Hernæan rock
Of Lemnos first from Ida; from the isle
The Athoan steep of mighty Jove received
The beaming beacon; thence the forward strength
Of the far-travelling lamp strode gallantly
Athwart the broad sea's back. The flaming pine
Rayed out a golden glory like the sun,
And winged the message to Macistus' watchtower.
There the wise watchman, guiltless of delay,
Lent to the sleepless courier further speed;
And the Messapian station hailed the torch
Far beaming o'er the floods of the Euripus.
There the grey heath lit the responsive fire,
Speeding the portioned message; waxing strong,

> And nothing dulled across Asopus' plain,
> The flame swift darted like the twinkling moon,
> And on Cithæron's rocky heights awaked
> A new receiver of the wandering light.
> The far-sent ray by the faithful watch not spurned,
> With bright addition journeying, bounded o'er
> Gorgopis' lake and Ægiplanctus' mount,
> Weaving the chain unbroken. Hence it spread
> Not scant in strength, a mighty beard of flame,
> Flaring across the headlands that look down
> On the Saronic gulf. Speeding its march,
> It reached the neighbour-station of our city,
> Arachne's rocky steep; and thence the halls
> Of the Atridæ recognized the signal,
> Light not unfathered by Idæan fire.
> Such the bright train of my torch-bearing heralds,
> Each from the other fired with happy news,
> And last and first was victor in the race.
> Such the fair tidings that my lord hath sent,
> A sign that Troy hath fallen."—P. 25.

These are noble translations, and may, in our opinion, vie with any in our language for united vigour and fidelity, attained without sacrificing the ease and freedom of the English idiom.

If the characteristic of Æschylus is stern and massive sublimity, that of Horace, in his Odes at least, is polished grace. He himself professed little more than to introduce to his countrymen the Lesbian lyre, and his ideas, scarcely less than his style and metre, are imitations from the Greek. His muse is a light and sportive nymph, who avoids the more arduous themes of heroic and warlike deeds, and makes no pretensions to sublimity. We are not sure that his translator, though in his Preface he has given an admirable estimate of the merits and rank of Horace as a poet, has been happy in conveying these characteristics to English readers by his verse. Though extremely skilful, and displaying a scholarship which cannot be impugned, we think there is in Mr. Newman's metres and expression an unpoetic stiffness and constraint which ill represent the genial brilliance of the sportive Venusian. This has, doubtless, partly arisen from the scrupulous accuracy with which he has tasked himself to render every idea, and almost every word, of his author. In literal fidelity he has kept closer to the Latin of Horace than Professor Blackie to the Greek of Æschylus; but the result has been the perhaps inevitable one, that his numbers move less easily. It may be questioned whether, in a metrical version of Horace, the retention of every phrase or idea be the most important part of the problem to be solved. As in the original it is the exquisite grace and finish of the language which charms the reader more than the sentiments themselves, so in a metrical translation this grace should be a first characteristic. The best

poetry is admired less, perhaps, for its matter than its form; it is "what all have thought, but none so well expressed;" and to no poetry is this more truly applicable than to the Odes of Horace. How far the actual words of a poet may be modified by his translator in order to save his melody, must be decided rather by individual taste than learned rule; but a translator who limits himself, as Mr. Newman does, to the same number of lines, and almost the same number of words, as the original, might claim, with advantage, as we think, to the general effect of his work, rather more licence than has been taken here. Another disadvantage of a too close rendering of the Latin words is, that to an unclassical reader (and for such, be it remembered, this version is intended) many of the sentiments, and even whole stanzas, must fail to convey any clear idea. To what merely English reader would the following lines be intelligible? Horace is excusing himself to Mæcenas for his laziness by alleging that he is in love. (No. xxxvi. Epode 14.)

> "So did a Samian tender form
> Kindle (they say) Anácreón of Téos,
> Who *to an easy shuffling foot*
> Oft wept his love *upon the tortoise hollow.*
> Thee too the flame torments; but if
> No *fairer blaze* laid sieged Troy in ashes,
> Joy in thy lot—."

Nor is their obscurity the only fault in these lines; for even though we assumed, which we do not, that "to an easy shuffling foot" were the best translation of "non elaboratum ad pedem," the image they suggest here is a homely and unsuitable one, conveying, as it does, the idea of careless and ungraceful indifference, singularly inappropriate as applied to a poet weeping his love, and surely not contained in the simple assertion of Horace, that he wept his love "to no laboured measure."

It is, we presume, the desire to give to Latin words and phrases individually their closest English representatives, which has led Mr. Newman sometimes to admit into his stanzas words which, to say the least, are prosaic, and will to many appear blemishes to otherwise beautiful lines. It is not always that even the most remarkable coincidences in the ideas of a classical word and its equivalent English will justify us in availing ourselves of it in a translation. In the one language an idiom may be poetical, which in the other may be vulgar. Should we be satisfied with a translator of Livy who should render "quum flumen aquæ vim vehat ingentem," "as the river carries a great *power of water*"? or of Herodotus, who should tell us that a temple contained "an infinite *sight of buildings*"? And yet the words *vis* and ὄψις remarkably coincide with the vulgar use of "power" and "sight," in the sense of large number or quantity. And, in the same way, a word may, per se, or in colloquial

prose, express most happily the idea contained in some Latin word, and yet be altogether inappropriate in poetry. This objection applies, we apprehend, to such renderings as the following.

No. ii. (Od. i. 15):

> "When the traitor swain with ships of Ida
> *Scurried* o'er the wave his hostess Helen."

No. xxiv. (Od. iii. 16):

> "Scorned is my estate, yet I more splendid
> Rule, than if,—amid great wealth unwealthy,—
> Mine the fame within my barns *to huddle*
> All that active Apulian reaps."

No. xxv. (Od. ii. 7):

> "*Teem* in shining bell-mouthed cups,
> Care-forgetting Massic!"

No. xli. (Od. i. 28):

> "What profit to have traversed
> With active mind the halls of air,
> And *raced* around the pole-star!"

We have, perhaps, dwelt longer on these blemishes than their comparative fewness or importance demands. We have no doubt the words, from whatever source obtained, have been deliberately chosen, and would be skilfully and learnedly defended by their author. Our only reply would be, that upon our ear they have jarred unpleasantly. We would by no means be understood, however, to deny the great merit and real beauty of the great majority of these Odes; and we think it likely, indeed, that to many, and especially to classical readers, they will lose much of their apparent stiffness, and become more pleasing on a repeated perusal.

We will close these remarks by presenting, as a fair sample at once of the Translation and of the Introductions and Notes by which each Ode is accompanied, the beautiful Ode to Dellius, No. lxxii. (Od. ii. 3).

"To Dellius.

"*Maxims of Epicurean Self-possession.*

"Quintus Dellius had changed his camp many times since the death of Caius Julius. He was successively a comrade of Dolabella, of Cassius, of Marcus Antonius. He accompanied the last of these into Parthia and Armenia, and rose into very important rank; but he deserted to Octavianus before the battle of Actium, and hereby secured his after fortunes. Knowing, as we do, the vices and calamitous weaknesses of Antonius, it seems impossible to judge any man severely for deserting him.

"From Horace's Ode we can only gather that Dellius was very rich, and wise enough to receive without offence moralizings of a very sombre nature. He was a man of some literary ambition, for he wrote a his-

tory of Antonius's campaign against the Parthians. This may have been the link between him and Horace.

"The exact year of the Ode is uncertain. It must have been *after* the fall of Antonius, B.C. 30, and may have been later than it is here placed; yet I have allowed it to adhere to No. 73, which it precedes in the common editions.

"The metre is as in No. 23.

"Watch in danger's hour thy heart
Calm to keep,—in happy lot
Temper'd alike from insolent gladness,
Dellius! Oh, to death predestined,

Whether sad thou alway live,
Or in grass remote reclined
On festal day, with old Falernian
Choice of seal, thou bless thy Genius;

Where the boughs of mighty pine
Love with poplar white to weave
A friendly shade; and fleeting waters
Strive in course oblique to hurry.

Hither wine and perfumes send,
Hither roses short-lived bloom;
While age, estate, and gloomy tissues
Wrought by Sisters Three, allow thee.

Soon must thou from purchased glades
Yield, where yellow Tiber laves
Thy palace-home; and keen successors
O'er thy high-built wealth shall revel.

Whether rich, of Inachus'
Ancient race thou be,—or poor,
Of meanest breed, unhoused,—concerns not
Thee, unpitying Orcus' victim.

All to one abode are bound:
Lots for all are tossed, which soon
Leap from the urn or late, and waft us
On the boat's eternal exile. Ode ii. 3.

"8. The jars of wine were closed with a wooden top, and the air excluded by a composition of pitch and resin, which was *sealed* with an appropriate stamp. The 'Genius' was honoured peculiarly on one's birthday. See No. 63.

"16. 'Three Sisters,' the three Fates.

"21. Inachus, King of Argos, in the earliest times: No. 65.

"24. Orcus (in Greek, 'an oath,' or that by which one swears) seems properly to have meant the river Styx, the oath of the gods; so Hom. Il. 2.—No. 41, v. 15.

"28. Boat—of Charon."

The arrangement adopted by Mr. Newman differs from that of the common editions, and in some respects from those of all previous ones. He does not, as some recent scholars have done, attempt to fix the place of every Ode, being convinced of the

impossibility of doing so; but taking those which contain allusions to contemporary events, and arranging them in the order indicated by these notes of time, he allows the rest to remain in the same relative position they occupy in the ordinary arrangement. Thus, as he says (p. vii), he has often allowed Odes to go together where he can give no convincing reason for it, but solely because they are already found together; and the entire series from Book ii. 13 to Book iii. 7, has been left by him undisturbed. But still we have virtually a chronological arrangement of all the Odes of which the chronology is determinable or important; and thus, while discrepancies and obscurities are considerably diminished, the Introductions go far to supply a sketch of the public history of the time, and of the leading events of the poet's own career.

B.

MIALL'S BASES OF BELIEF.*

The position in the religious world occupied by Mr. Miall, the Member of Parliament for Rochdale, may be regarded as one of the signs of the times. It is only very recently that a person possessing his peculiarities of opinion and intention, could have obtained the influence he exerts. Without possessing the sympathy either of the orthodox or heretical section of Dissent, he is distinguished above others for his advocacy of those common principles on which Dissent in all its forms properly rests. That he should have been able, on the ground of those principles alone, to gather around him the adherents he has, is a remarkable circumstance that might give occasion to some profitable reflection; and that he should have felt it his duty to put aside for the time what may be considered his special mission, and enter into the defence of Christianity against its opponents, is a circumstance no less remarkable.

The book we are about to introduce to the notice of our readers, is the result of this latter procedure. It is entitled *Bases of Belief*, and in our judgment it entirely fulfils the promise which that title contains.

We have seen it asserted, in apparent disparagement of this volume, that "it does not seek to prove that Christianity is absolutely true, but merely that it is as true as many other things which people never doubt." No one, we should think, would set himself to prove so inappropriate a thing as that Christianity is absolutely true, for the truth to which it lays claim is not of the absolute kind; but though resting upon a balance of proba-

* Bases of Belief: an Examination of Christianity as a Divine Revelation by the Light of recognised Facts and Principles. In Four Parts. By Edward Miall, M.P. London—Arthur Hall, Virtue and Co. 1853.

bilities, the argument in favour of that truth does not, as we are told, "simply come to this, that a great deal may be said on both sides." That argument, as here conducted, endeavours to shew that the balance on the side of Christianity is so overwhelming, as to leave no reasonable doubt of this side being the true one. Assured faith, and not "a subtle species of scepticism," is its legitimate result.

It is not our intention to construct anything in the nature of an analysis of Mr. Miall's work. We hope all who may favour us with their attention will read and study it for themselves. They will find it a masterly and conclusive treatise, eminently suited to the wants of the day. Its great value lies in its presenting at one view the strength of the Christian cause, as that cause is related to modern objections; and not in any originality of thought by which it may be distinguished. It presents that form of Christian defence which the special requirements of the opposition to Christianity now demand; and we recommend it as, in this regard, the most useful of the books with which it may be classed.

Mr. Miall very properly says of his book,—"This is not in any sense a book *of* Evidences in support of Christianity, but a book *on* Evidences in relation to the question."* He does not, however, merely mean that it is his object to remove preliminary objections to the reception of Christianity, but that he has in view the establishment of the validity of the kind of evidence on which Christianity relies for its support. His is a positive, not a negative purpose, which is thus explained immediately after the sentence just quoted: "The object has been to make out that the proof tendered on behalf of the gospel is of a kind which true philosophy is bound to accept."†

If he has accomplished the task he undertook, as we are persuaded he has, disbelief of Christianity, on the part of those who concur with his reasoning, is impossible. That reasoning goes not only to the point that Christianity is worthy of every possible consideration, but that it is in itself what it claims to be. Any one who simply casts his eyes over the plan of the work, must see that the whole question is professedly met so as to leave no door of escape to the unbeliever, if the profession be actually fulfilled.

Objections to Christianity relate either to the substance of its revelation, or to the alleged method of its disclosure, or to the form of its transmission; that is, they are either moral, scientific or historical. They are found in fact to be of all these kinds connected together; so that an attention to any one class of them would be ineffective, unless it also contemplated the sympathy and assistance supplied by the other classes. For instance, a treatise in answer to the moral and historical objections alone,

* Preface, p. iv. † Ibid.

would be inapplicable to the existing state of opinion, even where the scientific objections are not expressly urged; because both the former kinds of objection are really animated by an unacknowledged, and it may be an involuntary scepticism, communicated from the latter source. Mr. Miall, therefore, has only done his duty to his subject when he has passed under review all the three sorts of objection. This he has formally done. His book consists of four Parts, which he calls *The Phenomenon*, *The Revelation*, *The Seal*, and *The Record.* The first Part contains a statement of facts embracing the problem of Christianity as it presents itself to common observation; and the other three Parts examine its substance, the method of its manifestation, and the form in which it has been handed down to us.

The object of the introductory statement, made under the head of the Phenomenon, is to exhibit Christianity as an actual reality, whose character and power demand most serious and earnest investigation. It is a foolish perversion of that statement to say "it might have been abbreviated thus: Christianity has gained extensive popular acceptance; it follows, therefore, that it is entitled to all that it has gained." The utmost that is pleaded for as following from the state of things described is, that it ought to be satisfactorily explained by those who speculate upon the matter, and that the only satisfactory account which can be given of it, involves the truth of the gospel. Who can deny the reasonableness of the following conclusion to which this portion of the examination before us is brought?

"An immense number and variety of facts, strewn abundantly over the surface of history for nearly nineteen centuries, point to an active, powerful, and permanent spiritual force, operative more or less amongst men, throughout that whole period. That force we know to have been exerted upon society by the religious ideas presented to us in the writings constituting the New Testament, and by the special and peculiar form in which they have been so presented. But the New Testament refers us for the origin of that force to God. It claims to be a revelation of his mind and will—a showing of himself to mankind for their advantage—an uncovering of his thoughts and purposes, as it regards them, in such a light as may waken up the faculties of their spiritual nature, and give them meet exercise and enjoyment. Now is this claim intellectually inadmissible? Does it, in itself, and abstractedly, involve conditions at variance with the constitution of human nature, or unbecoming the character of the Supreme? Or is the form in which it is put—the drapery, if we may be allowed the figure, in which this professedly divine idea approaches man, to attract his attention, and kindle his hope, and engage his heart—ill adapted to its purpose, or out of keeping with the general laws which govern God's proceedings of an educational and disciplinary nature? Or is the evidence on which its authority rests, or are the alleged facts which testify to us that the idea is God's, comes from him, represents him, and will carry up the soul of man to him, such as can only be received by putting a strain upon our

reason, suspending or reversing our usual processes of investigation, or employing less stringent methods than is common with us in discriminating the real from the fictitious? Because, unless we are compelled to give to these queries an affirmative answer, there would seem to be no sufficient ground for rejecting the account which Christianity has given of itself."*

After thus laying down the question to be settled, the argument upon it proceeds in the following fashion. Moral objections to the substance of Christianity are met by confining its revelation to the exhibition of God in the human person of Christ, and proving the necessity of such an exhibition to supply the religious wants of mankind. Scientific objections to the peculiar method of Christian disclosure, are met by shewing that the supernaturalism in which this peculiarity consists, is not only credible and probable under the circumstances, but absolutely required in order to accomplish the ends proposed. And Historical objections to the form in which Christianity has been transmitted, are met by contending that the New Testament is worthy of dependence as a truthful record of the events it describes, in spite of the exceptions to its absolute accuracy which a hostile criticism may plead.

Let us suppose this course of investigation to be sustainable for the purposes to which it is directed, and we cannot refuse to concede our faith to Christianity as the legitimate result. These bases of belief, if true in themselves, are amply sufficient to support the cause of the gospel against all sceptical attacks. It must, indeed, be allowed that those arguments remain unanswered which rest upon the popular representations of Christian doctrine, and that nothing is done to vindicate the inspiration of the New Testament. But Christianity, so far from being injuriously affected by these omissions, is placed in a position more consistent with the real truth of the case, as well as more defensible in itself. We, at least, are prepared to give additional commendation to the effort which, while it answers fairly all objections that are themselves fair, puts aside those matters of prejudice whose force only lies in the false character they attribute to our faith.

A question of considerable interest is touched upon by our last remarks. Among the many advantages arising from that thorough sifting of the claims of Christianity which distinguishes the theological literature of the present day, none is more evident than is the tendency it has to purify the views of the Christian system which believers themselves entertain. That which is really vital to the religion of the gospel comes into its due place of importance when this religion has to be defended against its enemies, and the controversies among Christians sink into that subordinate relation to the great principles of their faith

* Pp. 61, 62.

which really belongs to them. It must, we should think, be apparent to the most prejudiced observer, that no form of Christian belief gains so much in the contest to which we refer, as Unitarianism does. There may be no acknowledgment made of conversion to its distinctive positions, but the actual assumption of them in some cases, and in others the very evident approach to them, indicates that it is on its grounds that the Christian cause can be most effectually supported. This condition of things is the more remarkable, because it is not the Unitarian form of Christianity which unbelievers are accustomed to select for attack; their main strength being directed, on the contrary, against the peculiarities of the orthodox scheme. We accept this as a striking testimony to the superior value of our simple faith; and we believe that more would be done for the establishment of Christianity by the spread of that faith, than by any other one cause. We hope, too, that the use of our weapons in this time of danger, will gradually produce a more generous treatment of the party to whom they legitimately belong: but, whether our hope be realized or not, of this we are fully persuaded, that the profession of one representation of Christianity within the church, in deference to an imposed creed, and the advancement of another representation before the world, in obedience to the moral necessities of the subject, will not long endure the test either of common honesty or common sense.

Mr. Miall's volume is the most favourable instance with which we are acquainted of that assimilation to Unitarian views of Christianity which a successful attempt to answer deistical objections naturally occasions. When we speak of it as a favourable instance, we mean that it conveys to us an impression of the sincerity of its author no less decided than is our satisfaction with the manner in which he has fulfilled his task. We believe that it truly expresses the relation in which he stands to the subject of his discussion, and is not liable to the charge of concealment of opinion or purpose.

It would be doing injustice to Mr. Miall to suppose that previously to the publication of this work he stood pledged to the creed of Evangelical Dissent. He has for a long time taken an independent position in that regard, and, refusing to identify himself with any of the Nonconformist bodies, has risen to be the leader of a large number of persons who plead for free thought and action in all religious affairs. He has not shrunk from expressing, under circumstances of great difficulty and danger, the peculiar views he holds, and he has invariably resisted every attempt of those with whom he has had to do, to bind him down to any fixed standard of theological belief. Those who have carefully marked his course, must have observed in him a gradual departure from what may be called the philosophy of orthodoxy, and the sentiments on the nature of Christianity which

have called forth this explanation, must be seen by such observers to harmonize with all the known antecedents of his case. Whatever other charge may lie against him, he is entitled to protest against being judged as a partizan of the popular belief.

The members of a sect—any and every sect—are always in danger of regarding the religious movements around them too much in the light of their particular sectarian interests, and the independent position assumed by Mr. Miall is sure to expose him to the consequences of this tendency on the part of those who agree with him, as well as on the part of those who differ from him.—If he thinks with us, why does he not join us? Why does he not, at least, separate himself from our opponents? Why does he use our arguments while he abstains from giving us the credit of them?—These are questions very likely to be pressed in the present case, without due consideration either of the real difficulties or the probable facts of that case. For ourselves, we are inclined to adopt the most generous judgment which such a case can admit of, and we willingly grant to Mr. Miall full liberty of action as to the connections which he himself may think his opinions sustain. We may believe that his views are substantially Unitarian, but he may not believe so. He may hold the views as to which we suppose him to agree with us, with a difference that may appear more important to his mind than it does to ours. He may not have accustomed himself to compare the results at which he has arrived with Unitarian conclusions, and may thus be ignorant of the identity that really exists. He may have formed ideas of Unitarianism which cause him, on other than theological grounds, to avoid a contact with it, or which restrain him from committing himself to all that he conceives to be included under the term. What we require from him, in such circumstances as these, is a clear and honest utterance of the sentiments he actually entertains, and a sympathetic demeanour towards those who exercise the same Christian liberty as himself; and in each of these respects we believe his conduct to be unimpeachable. We feel convinced that if he saw as we see in the matter, he would have distinguished between Orthodoxy and Unitarianism, as they are related to the general argument of the book under our notice; and therefore, though we wish that this distinction had been fairly pointed out in that book itself, we cannot regard the omission as a violation of the integrity with which we are convinced it was written. He has, we think, too plainly fixed his own theological position to render it possible for him to obtain credit for still retaining orthodox opinions on some of the most important points of Christian doctrine—and this we shall endeavour to establish; but his habits of thought may not have led him to draw the line between one theological theory and another so sharply as our controversial position obliges us to do; and he will very naturally be anxious

to seek for methods of explaining changes of opinion he has undergone, so as to indicate no farther divergence from the old paths than is absolutely necessary. He cannot, however, fail to see that he has taken his stand outside the circle of the established faith. When, therefore, he tells us that his statements "represent so much truth as the argument seemed to call for and no more, but it does not follow that he holds no more,"* we cannot understand him as pleading for the shelter of past associations, but as requiring to be judged no farther than he has given occasion for judgment. What he has said we have no doubt he will consistently adhere to, and he has a right to protest against "uncharitable suspicions" as to what his course of exposition did not authorize him to say.

Before we dismiss this part of our subject, we have to offer a word or two touching those professors of orthodoxy who may accept Mr. Miall's defence of Christianity as valid for the purpose to which it is applied. They are bound, on the same principle on which they concede approval to that defence, to acknowledge the Christian brotherhood of all those who hold the doctrines it maintains. The Christianity which is urged upon the unbeliever as demanding his faith, should not be disclaimed as unworthy of the name when the contest is with persons who have already yielded their faith to it. We are willing to make every allowance for the exercise of a discretion which does not commit itself in the Deistical controversy to more than is necessary for the plain setting forth of the Christian case; but we expect that the case, as set forth, should be adhered to in all its Christian admissions throughout the Unitarian controversy also.

One of the most interesting parts of this volume is the view it presents of the nature and purpose of Christianity, and the relation in which Christ himself stands to the religious system called by his name. We shall give an extract from it as introductory to some remarks which we wish to make upon the subject.

"It will be admitted, we imagine, by all who have given serious attention to the subject, that the writings, which together we designate the New Testament, constitute Jesus of Nazareth the key-stone of the system of faith which is inscribed with his name. They set him before us not merely as a spiritual teacher, who possessed a deeper insight into truths relating to God and the human soul than any foregoing prophet, but as 'God manifest in the flesh.' His life, his miracles, his labours, his trials, his sufferings, his death, are treated, not as the setting of his doctrine, but as the very sum and substance of the truth taught. We are introduced to him there not as one who told us what we did not know before, but as one whose person and history are the outward form and showing of that which he came to tell. 'He *is* the way, the truth, and the life,' therein differing essentially from those who only point it out. He requires of his disciples not so much that they should credit

* Preface, p. vi.

his sayings, as that they should believe on *him*. Everything in his hands assumes a personal shape—everything in the hands of those apostles who professed to interpret him to the world, derives its significance from its connexion with him personally considered. He is, in some peculiar and emphatic sense, the Son of God. His death is the secret of our life. He and his Father are one. To see him is to see the Father—for he is the image of the invisible God—'the brightness of his Father's glory,' in whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' Now, making every allowance for oriental hyperbolisms, it is sheer vanity to attempt an explanation of all this, on the hypothesis that Jesus Christ looked upon himself, and was looked upon by his immediate followers, as no more than an eminent religious teacher. No man, probably, unencumbered with a philosophy which he wishes to reconcile with the reputed facts and doctrines of Holy Writ, would rise from a candid perusal of the New Testament without confessing that, whatever human reason may say to it, the writers of that book plainly intended that men should look up to Jesus Christ, as the human expression of the Eternal Spirit. Not, indeed, that we are bound to take all the theological dogmatism which has been uttered on this theme, as warranted by the representations of it in Scripture—but that, unless we are justified in explaining away certain phrases as may best suit our preconceived notions, and in doing obvious violence to the drift and spirit of the entire volume, we are bound to regard the peculiar mission of Christianity, as explained by itself, to be the revelation of the Divine mind and purpose through the medium of a human life and history.

"If this be a true account of the obvious and explicit purport of the gospel of Christ—and, to say the least, this account requires us to put no strain on the tenour of the records—then Christianity presents itself to us in this wise—It is a translation of the idea of God into a language intelligible to the religious sensibilities of man. The works of creation interpret him to the intellectual powers—the life of Christ, to the moral sympathies. The action of physical mechanism supplies the alphabet in the one case—of moral mechanism, in the other. Logic is for the understanding—love is for the heart. And truly, the plan, on the first blush of it, appears to be well suited to our nature and its wants. Our religious constitution, partaking far more largely, as we have seen, of the emotional than of the ratiocinative element, demands, in order to its full development, an emotional representation to it of the objects with which it was designed to be conversant. Can we conceive of this demand being met in any other way, equally efficacious, than by the showing them to us in a human form and dress? The abstract truths expressive of divine excellences are powerless in themselves to kindle our affections or to govern our will. How can they be best embodied so as that we may choose them as our companions for daily converse, our guardians and our guides for confiding consultation, our ministering angels in our hours of sorrow, our heart's portion for time and for eternity? In what accents can our sense of guilt—a sense which no ingenious reasonings of ours can wholly extinguish—be spoken unto, so as that all gloomy anxieties shall give place to a quiet and abiding peace of conscience? How can those our obligations to the Author of our being be so presented to our will, as to secure not only its constrained acquiescence in their propriety, but its delighted recognition of, and

passionate surrender to, their claims? If it be the benign purpose of the Supreme to allure us to that higher sphere of being, activity, and enjoyment, in which our noblest capabilities may have full scope for exercise and satisfaction, how better could he do it than by putting his truth, his purity, his love, his will and purpose concerning us, into the shape of a man's history crowded with passages which come right home to our inmost and tenderest sympathies? What are the chief, the all-but irresistible, instrumentalities by which heart moves heart? How, usually, are strong wills bowed, and violent prejudices soothed to sleep, and fierce enmities overborne and slain? By the numerous expressions and acts in which disinterested kindness will dress itself—by magnanimous self-sacrifice, by cheerful exposure to wrong, by meek forbearance under wrong, by the helping hand when help is needed, by the silent tear of commiseration when suffering is endured, by heroic enterprise for others' benefit, by long and unwearied consistency in pursuit of benevolent ends. These are charmed agencies all the world over. These have ever been found, and will ever continue to be, 'the cords of love and the bands of a man' the most potent to draw the will of humanity whithersoever he would who wields them. There is scarcely a depth of degradation to which we can sink from which these might not drag us—scarcely an eminence of virtue within the possibility of man's attainment to which these might not lead us on. Well, it is precisely by this class of agencies that Christianity professes to reveal to our moral nature the All-wise God otherwise invisible to it, or, at best, but 'dimly seen.' And hence, the convergence of all the lines of light in the person of Jesus Christ—hence, the intensely personal character of the entire system—hence, the earnest and reiterated direction of faith, hope, and love, to him, rather than to his oral utterances. What he discoursed of God is not referred to as the principal medium by which he imaged the Deity to man's heart—but rather what he *was*, what he did, what he suffered,—his purity, his all-comprehensive benevolence, his heroic self-sacrifice, his tenderness, his meekness. Herein we are instructed to look for the manifested God—to attain to the truest understanding of what he is morally—what are his regards to us—whither he would lead us—and how deep and moving is his love to us. Here affection displays itself with a view to excite affection—the appeal to moral sympathy is made by a previous exhibition of moral sympathy—and in the natural language of human deeds, struggles, tears, distresses, death, we have translated to us the else unutterable thoughts, propensions, and will of the ever-blessed God."*

Perhaps it may be well for us to confirm this statement by another passage or two which may emphatically reiterate its principle. The book is, indeed, full of such reiterations.

"Christianity as a professed revelation of God is a disclosure of the moral aspect of the Divine Being, both as to his attributes and his will, so far, at least, as it can affect man's interests and destiny, *through the medium of a human personage and life.*"†

"On examination of the claims of this objective faith, or, in one word, Christianity, we find its great distinctive characteristic to be this

* Pp. 116—121. † P. 138.

—that it professes to exhibit to the religious capabilities and sensibilities of man, through the medium of one man's life and history, the moral character and purposes of God."*

"What the body of man is to his spirit—its instrument of communication with the outer world, that the life of Christ is assumed to be in reference to God—his medium of moral communication to mankind. He, the Everlasting, the Creator and Ruler of the universe, the self-existent and eternal Spirit—he expresses his mind, and character, and will, by means of this one life, and puts himself, so far as this was possible, into the garb of humanity—or, changing the figure, gives us a human version of his own Being—his thoughts, purposes, and propensions—in its relation to man."†

We heartily concur with the general tenor of the representation we have just exhibited. We believe that the position it attributes to Christ is the cardinal truth concerning him with which the gospel furnishes us. We are, however, not prepared so far to exclude the communication of religious truth to mankind from the divine manifestation which was made through Christ, as Mr. Miall's language would justify. Such truth was in ample measure revealed by him at the same time at which he established that moral influence to which the purpose of his mission is here almost wholly confined. We go even farther than this in the direction to which we are pointing. When we compare the religious communications made by Christ with the doctrines on the same subjects which mankind had previously held, and when we add to the better form of his religious teaching the incomparably stronger evidence by which he supported it, we do not hesitate to speak of him as bringing *new* truth to light. In fact, we think it is quite impossible to separate the moral influence from the didactic agency of Christ, so as to reason consistently upon the one, without taking the other into our account; and we should have preferred that the two had been professedly united in the picture constructed by Mr. Miall, to a greater extent than they are. We believe his argument would have gained both clearness and force from the union; and we think that in this way all objection to that argument which insists upon the uselessness of a supernatural sanction to a mere moral display of the Deity, might have been avoided.

It is, however, but fair that we should allow Mr. Miall to give a more explicit account of his views on the relation of Christianity to the discovery of religious truth, than our quotations so far have afforded.

"There is little or nothing in the sacred writings of Christianity calling attention to the fact that it is making a discovery of truths which the human mind could never have reached. All the primary notions of divine things which it embodies, it rather takes for granted, than announces as novelties. There is about it no air of 'exclusive in-

* P. 154. † P. 167.

telligence'—nothing in style or expression which suggests that the writers felt in general like men who are communicating secrets to which no intellect could have pierced its way. For the most part, they tell their story as men expecting to be credited because they were familiar with the facts they narrated; and upon those facts they make comments, and base doctrines, and found obligations, precisely as men might have done who thought them pertinent and obvious, but who had no suspicion that they were unveiling truths which had been supernaturally disclosed to them."*

"It needs but a slight study of the biographical memoirs of its founder, and of the interpretative epistles of his immediate followers, to be convinced that its display of God is almost exclusively moral, with a view to moral results—in a word, and using terms and figures not strictly appropriate, but accommodated to our weakness—it is a revelation of heart to heart in order to sympathy, and not a communication of mind to mind in order to knowledge."†

In expressing our full concurrence with the representation of Christianity given above, on its positive, if not on its negative side, we must distinctly declare our conviction that it is irreconcilable with orthodoxy. If this view of the matter be true, the orthodox view is false. The former cannot justly be held as supplementary to the latter, for the two proceed upon directly opposite principles.

The orthodox scheme of the Christian redemption rests upon the principle of satisfaction to the Deity. That principle, according to the scheme, presents the essential necessity upon which the whole matter of human salvation turns. To exclude this principle is to destroy the scheme itself. Here the principle is excluded. Though the great purpose of Christianity is professedly developed so as to exhibit the characteristic point on which Christian evidences should be made to bear, divine satisfaction constitutes no part of that purpose. These evidences are, therefore, erroneously applied, and their validity is incorrectly conceived of, if the idea of such satisfaction is to be upheld by them. The whole argument in their favour must be re-constructed, and a different religious philosophy must be substituted for the one advocated, before orthodoxy can be placed in that vital relation to the subject which its very nature demands. The satisfaction scheme can have no existence, unless as the necessary foundation of the whole spiritual economy with which it may be united.

This doctrine of the manifestation of God by Christ, and the doctrine of satisfaction to God by him, are, moreover, irreconcilable in other respects than that of its being impossible for the latter to occupy its place in the Christian system, when that system is supposed to be essentially characterized by the former. They are irreconcilable in themselves. The one offers a view of the Divine intention with regard to the mediation of Christ, to

* Pp. 77, 78. † P. 84.

which the other is opposed. We understand Mr. Miall distinctively to teach, that the manifestation of the Deity made by Christ was designed for human imitation. He insists upon the human form in which it appeared, as comprising on this account one of the primary advantages attaching to it. Thus the justice and benevolence of God displayed in this form, are considered by him as adapted to excite the same justice and benevolence in us; and the death of Christ is set forth in that character of self-sacrifice which brings it within the range of our practical duty. So far is this true, that, as we have already intimated, if there be a fault in the representation under review, it is the too exclusive connection of what Christ said and did with the moral sympathies of mankind. On the other hand, the satisfaction theory, in all its modifications, contemplates a kind of conduct on the part of God which is altogether removed from the sphere of our imitation. It has respect to principles of action which are quite peculiar to the station of the Divine Being. The justice and benevolence it unfolds are not designed to direct our action, but to constitute the ground of our faith; and the death of Christ especially is put forward by it as fulfilling certain ends in the economy of man's salvation which have no bearing at all upon any sense of duty that ought to influence us. To state the case only thus, would indeed be to put the opposition we are endeavouring to illustrate in far too mild a shape. The ideas of justice and mercy which a satisfaction to the Deity implies, are not only peculiar to the station occupied by the Almighty, but they are in principle different from anything we are required to cultivate under the names of justice and mercy. Were we to imitate the representation which orthodoxy gives us of the Divine conduct, we should undoubtedly be chargeable with immorality; and the practical substitution of the innocent for the guilty, which the death of Christ is popularly supposed to involve, would be universally condemned as a violation of social order and equity. Here, then, is a contrariety of principle between the object of Christ's mission as Mr. Miall states it, and the object of that mission as interpreted by the satisfaction scheme. The two objects cannot be harmonized with each other. They are mutually destructive. To produce a merely apparent harmony, orthodoxy is obliged to make violent use of its theory of two natures in Christ, connecting the virtue of the satisfaction offered by him with the one, and the virtue of the example set by him with the other. But this method of forcing two irreconcilable things into a mechanical union, is prevented in the case before us by the frequent and emphatic statement, that it is "as the human expression of the Eternal Spirit" that Christ acts upon the sympathies of our nature,—"the revelation of the Divine mind and purpose through a human life and history," being the description of Christ's relation to God, as well as of his relation to man.

No question relating to the evidences of Christianity has been more strenuously agitated than that of the authority belonging to the miraculous facts of the Gospels.

There can be no doubt as to the relation in which these facts were placed by our Lord and his apostles. They regarded them as proofs of the divinity of his mission. "Believe me for the very works' sake," was his own exhortation with reference to them; and that he was "approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him," was the persuasion of his followers. When the question is whether miracles were originally treated as Christian evidences, such declarations as these must be taken to be decisive of the fact, although we might even find exceptions to the rule of judgment which that fact expresses. We believe, indeed, no such exceptions can be substantiated; and that when Christ refused to work miracles "because of unbelief," he referred simply to the unbelief of the subjects, and not of the objects of these operations.

We are, in these days, sometimes presented with the strange phenomenon of a person who acknowledges the truth of the gospel miracles, but who denies their validity as proofs of the connection of Christ with God. We call this a strange phenomenon, because there is an inherent absurdity in the very statement of the opinion entertained. If a man believes the truth of a miracle, whatever he may conceive to be the purpose for which it was wrought, he must believe that Almighty power was exerted in connection with it. Under the influence of that belief, it is impossible for him to deny that, for all the ends to which it is legitimately applicable, the miracle proves the connection of God with the circumstances of the case. Nothing more than this would be required by any one who pleaded for the divine authority which miracles are supposed to establish, and this cannot be logically withheld without renouncing their reality. Mr. Hume so far rejected the credibility of miracles as to assert that "the absolute impossibility or miraculous nature of the events which they relate, in the eyes of all reasonable people will alone be regarded as a sufficient refutation" of a cloud of witnesses; and it was therefore open to him to contend that "a miracle can never be proved so as to be the foundation of a system of religion:" but when a person admits not only the credibility, but the actual reality of the miracles connected with Christianity, a denial of the proof of divinity they involve is no longer open to him. It is of no avail to say that a miracle will not prove a doctrinal truth, for it is in no instance with which we are acquainted brought forward under that intention. It proves the presence and working of God in the case to which it relates, and its bearing upon truth arises from the indirect application of that circumstance, and not from any direct doctrinal application it may have. Neither is it of any avail to say that miracles them-

selves cannot be proved, unless they are justified by the moral character of the manifestation to which they refer. The moral approval we accord to such a manifestation, and the divine authority we concede to it, are two very different things; and, though the one be necessary to the belief of the other, it does not supersede the special use which, when thus authenticated, the fact of omnipotent interference may be made to serve. There is an admirable practical statement of the force of the connection between miraculous facts and divine authority made by Dr. Price in the following terms:

"It has been objected, that supposing the reality of the miraculous facts of Christianity, there is no connection between them and the truth of its doctrines. This, in my opinion, is to trifle inexcusably; nor can it be worth any Christian's while to say a word in answer to it, till one person is found who can honestly declare that he believes the miracles of Christ, but denies his divine mission."*

Mr. Miall appears to us to have managed his argument on the station which miracles occupy in the Christian system, with great discrimination and effect; and we particularly thank him for the manner in which he has shewn that the quality of power specially involved in a miracle, was necessary to the completion of the divine authentication which the mission of Christ required. We will, even at the risk of taking away by an abridgment some of the force of what he has said, lay before our readers a portion of his exposition of this topic.

"We contend that apart from some display of omniscience and Almighty power, such as is given in prophecy and in miraculous acts, there could have been no revelation through a human life of *any* of the perfections of God, in such a manner as would enable us to identify them as incontestably his. These are the only attributes of Deity, presentable, at least, through the medium of a man's history, which may be distinguished clearly and infallibly from all the semblances of them which ordinary humanity may produce. The wisdom of a wise man, for instance, and the wisdom of a man in whom might dwell 'the fulness of the Godhead bodily,' differ, to our capabilities of perception, in degree only, nor are there any well-defined limitations, and cognisable lines of distinction, having regard to which we may pronounce satisfactorily to our reason—'the wisdom on this side is human, on the other side is divine.' We cannot say with certainty how far the mind of man, under the operation of merely natural laws, is capable of exhibiting this glorious endowment—what are the limits within which human imperfection will necessarily confine it—or to what extent a combination of happy opportunities, a fine organization, and assiduous culture, might possibly develop it."†

"A similar line of observation will apply to all the moral attributes of God—truth, rectitude, goodness, and the like. Taken alone, or even in association one with another, it needs a very nice discriminating power to determine, in any given illustration made through humanity,

* Price's Four Dissertations, p. 457, note. † Pp. 174, 175.

whether what is exhibited of them comes directly from himself, or is only indirectly reflected in the manner in which every good man shows forth the glory of the Deity. The life of Christ might have been a perfectly faultless embodiment of them all, without having in it, for the rest of men, any other force than that of example. We could not have collected from them, however lustrously exhibited, that they were manifestations to us of the Unseen God—nor would they by themselves have sufficed to prove a direct appeal of the Divine will made to ours. The declaration by our Lord himself of his purpose and mission would, indeed, have been rendered the more credible by these qualities of his character—but in an affair of such unspeakable importance, we should reasonably have craved more decisive confirmation. For, it is conceivable that a man may be under some mental illusion as to the main purport of his life, and yet exhibit in marvellous perfection these attributes of moral character—nay, the extraordinary strength with which they are developed in him, may itself suggest to his active imagination a reason and an end for their existence which have no foundation in reality. But there are other moral qualities in the life of Christ which derive their whole significance from his assumed mission—which not only do not bear upon themselves the exclusive imprint of divinity, but which without some accompanying attestation lose very much of their own meaning. Condescension, humility, meekness, patience, voluntary subjection to suffering, an anxious solicitude for the welfare of others, will operate with a powerful force upon our moral sympathies, if we are assured that they are an authorized version, in a human type, of the mode in which God regards, and will deal with us. But unless they have upon them this specific meaning—unless there is clearly written upon them the Divine name, they instantly sink into the merest commonplace. Condescension ceases to be such—humility loses its principal charm—meekness and gentleness are robbed of their exquisite pathos—suffering can no longer be regarded as voluntary—and concern for the well-being of others becomes transmuted from a rich consolation to bleeding hearts, and a soothing assurance to terrified consciences, into an amiable trait of character which, however we may admire, can constitute no basis for our trust. Behind all these must be the radical idea of God, in order to give them due moral power over our sympathies. Unless it can be fully ascertained that He is the soul of which these are the countenance—that it is none other than He, who, when humanly represented, is thus disposed towards men—there is practically no revelation at all. Everything may be divine in reality—but it is not so to our apprehensions. Nor, indeed, can it become so without something additional, and much more distinctive. We could only regard the life of Christ as a very fitting one for the manifestation of God in the flesh—but we could not confidently receive it, as marked off from human life in general, to answer this high purpose to our souls. Neither his wisdom, nor those moral attributes of his to which we have adverted, carry with them to our convictions any sufficient and decisive confirmation of his own claim to be received as the *only*-begotten Son of God."*

"This want nothing but a miraculous display of power can adequately meet. An individual working in visible subjection to the physical laws

* Pp. 176—179.

of Nature, may indeed effect astounding results, but none which surely connect him with an express moral purpose of his Creator. But a man working at will, quite irrespectively of all natural antecedents and sequents, setting them aside and overruling them at pleasure, exhibits just that phase of the Supreme which cannot be mistaken for a mere exaltation of human powers. The difference between the one action and the other is a difference not of degree, but of kind. We instinctively attribute the settled order of Nature to the will of the Sovereign Creator—we believe that that order cannot be disturbed, in any given instance, save in conformity with the will by which it was established—and from any series of well-proven facts, if such facts there may be, exhibiting results brought about in entire independence of fixed physical laws, we irresistibly draw the conclusion, that the power to which they owe their existence is divine. And it is essential to observe, that power exerted at the instance of man, can only be demonstrated to be 'the power of God' when it *is* thus independent of the established order of things. If put forth in conformity with ascertainable and ordinary cause and effect, it proves nothing beyond a knowledge of the laws of Nature, and skill in applying them. It would not take us out of the assigned or assignable limits of the human, and land us within those of the divine. If, therefore, God was to show himself *as God* by means of a man's life and history—if the manifestation of him, to be complete and to the purpose, must necessarily exemplify his power—and if that power, to be rendered capable of identification with his direct will, must be exerted otherwise than in conformity with pre-existing physical laws—then, it is obvious that, granting the life of Christ to have for its object the representation of Deity through humanity for moral ends which could not otherwise be attained, the working of miracles will be a necessary feature of that life—a feature which being present seals the whole as divine—a feature which being absent subjects the whole to reasonable doubt, and deprives it almost entirely of its practical moral value."*

The character and use of the New Testament as a record of the facts of Christianity, occupies a considerable part of Mr. Miall's attention. He says, and we believe justly says on this point,—

"The advocates of Christianity as a revelation of God have done all that can be required of them by the soberest reason, in vindication of the New Testament as a record of facts, when they have succeeded in placing the history upon a level for trustworthiness with ancient history in general, and in showing that the writers were as truthful in their purpose, as conscientious in their statements, and as capable of testing the worth of their materials, as any men of any age, whose historical works have come down to us. We think much more than this can be done—but this, we contend, will amply suffice for a solid basis of reasonable belief."†

On the subject to which the foregoing extract refers, we sometimes meet with a confusion of thought which deserves a word of notice. It is contended that because supernatural facts require a degree of evidence not necessary in the case of natural ones,

* Pp. 182, 183. † Pp. 319, 320.

therefore the historical medium through which the former facts may be transmitted, should possess a higher character of validity than ordinary history demands. This is a very plain mistake. The medium by which testimony is conveyed to us is a very different thing from the testimony itself, and the validity of the one depends upon considerations distinct from the validity of the other. The method in which information is transmitted cannot justly be made responsible for the nature and value of the information itself; and therefore, though the latter may demand extraordinary support, the former will be sufficient for its purpose, if possessed of the ordinary claims upon our belief. It is not by any means needed that the record of revelation should be miraculous in order that it may substantiate the miraculous character of the revelation it describes.

Mr. Hume fell into an error of the same kind as that we are now exposing, when he declared "that no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish." This was, in effect, to say, that a miraculous event demands a miraculous testimony to support it, and the whole tenor of Mr. Hume's argument is only reconcilable with that view of the case. Such strong affirmations may manifest how rooted was his conviction of the absolute impossibility of miraculous operations; but their very strength is their weakness; for nothing can be easier of proof than that the nature of a miracle, and the nature of the evidence by which it is supported, are as clearly separable from each other as are the two provinces of fact and truth.

In consistency with the bearing of our last quotation, Mr. Miall excludes the doctrine of Biblical Inspiration from having any influence upon his argument.

"What we mean—*all* that we would be understood to mean—and what we shall hereafter attempt to make good, is this—that the spiritual authority of that revelation of his character and designs which God has vouchsafed to us by Jesus Christ, resides in the *facts* of which that life consisted, and not in the written *record* of those facts—and that even if it could be demonstrated that the penmen who have given us memorials of that life, and of the events which were preparatory to, and consequent upon it, were indebted to no other aid than that supplied by mental and moral qualifications which any other writers might possess in common with themselves, the main strength of Christianity, as a communication to mankind of God's mind and will, would remain untouched."*

"We place the record in a false position, and do it a gross injustice, when we treat it as if *it* were the revelation, instead of being only the window, as it were, through which we look out and see one. We subject it to a vast amount of superfluous, and, we may add, unfair criticism and cavil, by our misapprehension of its true place and func-

* Pp. 307, 308.

tions. It is as though we persisted in maintaining that the glass through which we looked at the moon is identical with the heavenly body seen by its aid, and that every speck of defilement on the surface of the glass pertains, not to the medium of our vision, but to the object which shines through it. The strange and mistaken fancy might be of little consequence to ourselves—but another, adopting our theory, might shake our faith in the reality of the object seen by proving that no such appearances as are given to it by the glass we use, can, by any possibility, belong to the moon itself."*

The manner in which Mr. Miall looks toward the doctrine of Inspiration after he has thus declined to avail himself of its aid, is not altogether satisfactory to us. He seems to think it possible that this doctrine may be consistently held in union with that use of the Scriptures for which he contends, and that his method of dealing with the critical objections urged by unbelievers may be fairly adopted by those who believe that the record itself is a miraculous production. We cannot agree with him in this opinion. The objections conceded by him, though reconcilable with the integrity of the New Testament as a record of the Christian events, are not reconcilable with any intelligible theory of the inspiration of that volume, and the concessions ought not to be made by any one who holds such inspiration. A conscientious dealing with this subject imposes upon men the open acknowledgment and honest application of their own convictions with regard to it. No person is justified in conceding that which he believes to be false; and it is of the utmost importance that all expositions of religious truth should be conducted with the most scrupulous accuracy and sincerity in relation to the actual position of those who offer them. The utmost that could be honourably done in such a case as the one before us, is to construct an argumentum ad hominem under strong protest against its legitimate bearing upon the matter. This is not at all the tone Mr. Miall adopts, and therefore we do not judge him as really retaining faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, though he declares "his own unfaltering belief that the writers of the New Testament were under divine guidance in composing their several memoirs of Christ." We wish that his language on this head had been less vague than it is; but inasmuch as, though rejecting the doctrine of Inspiration, we could ourselves employ the expressions we have just quoted, we give him the full benefit of that acceptation of them which answers to the perfect truthfulness of his general reasoning on the point.

The doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures exerts a much more powerful influence upon the nature of Christianity itself than Mr. Miall appears to be aware of. It affects the very substance of the gospel. If the New Testament be a miraculous production for the religious guidance of mankind, it must be received and treated with all the divine homage which its imme-

* Pp. 316, 317.

diate connection with God necessitates. As such, it stands to us, not in the relation in which Mr. Miall places it, but in that incomparably higher relation in which he places the manifestation of Christ alone. The whole of his discussion would be most seriously interfered with, and rendered useless in some of its vital parts, if that kind of religious regard were to be paid to the Bible which the belief in inspiration demands. It is, moreover, the existence of that belief, in itself and in the consequences naturally arising from it, that forms one of the greatest obstacles to the reception of Christianity; and, under the present circumstances of the Christian controversy, it is especially incumbent upon those who believe, with regard to this question, that "the letter killeth, while the spirit giveth life," to clear themselves from all possible misunderstanding upon a subject which so nearly affects the highest interests of mankind.

Γ.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE IN THE ROLLS COURT.

Since the publication of the last No., we have received copies of two additional affidavits filed in the Rolls Court previous to the hearing of the Petition of the Trustees of Manchester New College.

Rev. William Turner states that he is 90 years of age; that he is and has for many years been a Visitor of Manchester New College; that he was a student at Warrington Academy, whence he removed to Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where for sixty years and upwards he officiated as an English Presbyterian minister; that he remembers the founding of Manchester New College in the year 1786, and has been a Trustee since 1805; that the College was removed to York in consequence of the difficulty of finding any qualified person to undertake its management in Manchester; that it was not by that act intended by the Trustees to dissolve the institution at Manchester and establish another at York; that during its continuance at York its affairs were managed by a Committee at Manchester, and on Mr. Wellbeloved's resignation it was brought back to Manchester.

James Yates, Esq., of Lauderdale House, Middlesex, states that he is a Fellow of the Royal Society, M.A. of the University of Glasgow, and that he matriculated and studied in the Universities of Edinburgh and Berlin; that he entered Manchester College, York, September, 1808, and remained there till 1810, and that he is a Trustee of older standing than any of the petitioners; that he dissents from and resists the decision of the majority of the Trustees to remove the College, because he regards it as directly opposed to its fundamental laws, and subversive of the purposes for which it was established. He further states that his father, a Dissenting minister of Liverpool, was in 1786 one of the original founders of Manchester College; that he has been on terms of intimacy with other founders of the College, and that he believes their main design was to erect an academical institution in the North of England; that his father was an original contributor to both Hackney and Manchester College, but that he insisted on the expediency of having a College in the North. After giving his reasons for dissenting from the opinion that the ruling motive of the founders in selecting Manchester was the desire of securing the services of Dr. Barnes and Mr. Harrison, Mr. Yates says, that in his opinion Manchester College has not proved a failure, except in respect to the number of its lay students; that it would be in accordance with the intentions of the founders now to resort to Owens College; that the principles of that institution are identical with those of Manchester College, and that its Professors are men of

high ability, and that he sees no reason for preferring University College to Owens College; that in his opinion the removal of the Manchester College to London will occasion loss and inconvenience to students of humble circumstances residing in the North of England. He further states that the Hackney College existed only about ten years, and, according to the statement of Mr. William Morgan, the biographer of Dr. Price, after an inglorious existence and the expenditure of £20,000, sunk into irretrievable ruin; and that he fears that University College and University Hall contain the same elements of dissolution—the burthen of building debts and financial difficulties; that from these difficulties Manchester New College is exempt, having been conducted with less display and in a more prudent and economical manner. He further says, that in his opinion Manchester New College is greatly indebted to Mr. W. Rayner Wood and his father and grandfather, for their valuable services ever since the establishment of the College; that Rev. William Wood saved the College from dissolution at an important crisis of its history; that the late Mr. George William Wood served as Treasurer for thirty-five years with unwearied diligence; that by his prudence and zeal the College estates increased in value from £4000 to £16,000; that in 1839 the said G. W. Wood warmly opposed the projected removal to London; that Mr. W. Rayner Wood succeeded on his father's death to the office of Treasurer, and until 1852 discharged its duties with judgment, diligence and fidelity, and that he is still deeply devoted to the interest and welfare of the College.

LETTER FROM REV. WM. ROBERTSON, D.D., TO DR. PERCIVAL.

[At the present time, when attention is so much directed to the history of Manchester College, the letter of this eminent historian and divine will be read with interest.]

Buxton, Nov. 6, 1785.

I return you thanks for your obliging attention in communicating to me the plan of your new Academy at Manchester. I had so many opportunities of being acquainted with the abilities of the masters and the proficiency of the students in the Academy at Warrington, that I could not but think favourably of the institution, and regret the dissolution of it. I hope it will now revive with the same liberal spirit at Manchester, and, under another name, pursue the same useful objects. I can see no interference of your scheme with the new plan of education which is forming in the South. There is room for both; and if they shall be established on such principles as one may expect from the spirit of the age, I hope they may become seminaries of education, not for Dissenters only, but for persons of every denomination. If you shall be of opinion that an academical degree* may be of any benefit to any of the masters in your new institution, I need not say that any recommendation coming from you or my good friend Mr. B——, will be received by me with the greatest attention. * * *

* The extract given above is taken from the Memoirs of Dr. Percival, by his son Dr. Edward Percival. In the same volume it is stated, that the friendship between Dr. Percival and Dr. Robertson was contracted while the former was a student in the University of Edinburgh, and that it was the source and occasion of the academic degrees conferred on Dr. Priestley, Dr. Enfield and Dr. Nicholas Clayton. In a letter, dated College, Edinburgh, March 8, 1774, Dr. Robertson writes to Dr. Percival,—"We wish in this College not to confer honorary degrees, either in divinity or law, without duly considering the merit of the candidates. But I am happy when we can confer that mark of esteem upon any of our Dissenting brethren. Mr. Enfield appears to me a very ingenuous and deserving man. We owe the merit of having distinguished Dr. Priestley to you."

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF REV. JOHN KENRICK, DELIVERED TO THE TRUSTEES AND STUDENTS OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, IN THE COMMON HALL, JUNE 23, 1853.

In addressing you once more and for the last time within these walls, my young friends, at the conclusion of your Examination, I am very glad that I can repeat the expression of satisfaction to which I and my respected predecessor in the office of Visitor have so often given utterance. What we have seen and heard of the results of your studies has shewn that your instructors have led you into varied fields of knowledge, and that you have diligently and successfully used the opportunity of enriching your minds and preparing yourselves for the profession which you have chosen. Your Professors have borne testimony also to the propriety of your conduct, in obedience to the laws and in your general demeanour. At a moment when a change is contemplated which some of your friends view with apprehension, as if it would be the means of exposing you to greater temptation, it is peculiarly satisfactory to have all the security which the past experience of your conduct can give. The fears of those who thought that the abandonment of the domestic system, when the College was removed from York, would be followed by a deterioration in the moral character of the students, have been proved by the event to be groundless. Never, I believe, has study been pursued with a more conscientious devotion of time, never has less been sacrificed to frivolous amusement or expensive pleasures; never has the conduct of the students as a body been more free from the reproach or even the suspicion of immorality, than since the establishment of the College in this place. The ardour with which your literary and scientific studies have been pursued here, is attested not only by the rewards bestowed by our own institution, but by the honourable trophies which, as you heard yesterday, your predecessors have won in a much wider competition. Not to dwell on other distinctions, with our limited numbers and in a short period, we had already reckoned three medallists among the graduates who had studied wholly or partially among us; and you have heard that since the present examination began, a fourth has been added to the list in the person of Mr. Addyes Scott. Looking to this splendid series of honours, we may say literally as well as figuratively, "Primo avulso non deficit alter Aureus, et simili frondescit virga metallo." On those of you, my young friends, who may accompany the College in its removal, rests the honourable duty of proving that your habits of diligence and good conduct are not dependent on place and circumstance, but are the result of virtuous habit and Christian principle. It is very encouraging to know that a character similar to your own prevails among those young men with whom, as inmates of a kindred institution, you will be brought into more immediate connection. May you be helpers to each other in the studies which you jointly pursue, by friendly aid and emulation, and hereafter, in your various walks of life, fulfil the duties for which your academical training has prepared you!

I may now, perhaps, be allowed to leave the ordinary topics of address on this occasion, and to advert to the peculiar circumstances in which we meet to-day. We are about to enter on a new period of our existence as a College, and to make what all must consider to be in

some degree an experiment. The great crises of our individual life, the transition from one period to another, the dissolution of old and the formation of new connections, can never take place without very mixed feelings; and regret for what we leave is perhaps never so strong as at the moment when we must make the final change. We may possibly better understand our position, if we look further back than the last stage of our progress. We may perhaps discover that it has been the result of circumstances scarcely noticed while in operation, but which have made themselves imperatively felt in their result.

I do not refer to the question on which the opinions of the best friends of the College have been so much divided—a provincial or a metropolitan locality, but to the conviction in which we were nearly unanimous, that the time had arrived when it was expedient to unite ourselves with some other institution, and no longer endeavour to maintain from our own resources a complete system of literary, scientific and theological education. When we recollect that to do all this has been our aim and our pride in past times, and what strenuous exertions have been made to provide such an education, of a quality proportioned to the wants of the age, we may feel surprised at the change which has taken place in our convictions. A short retrospect of academical history amongst us will, I think, clearly explain it.

When the Confessors of Bartholomew-day abandoned the churches in which they had ministered and the universities in which they had studied and taught, nothing was further from their thoughts than that they were leaving them for ever. They were mindful of the country from which they had come out, and if they had had opportunity they would have returned. They believed that their own opinions would be again triumphant, or at least that they should be re-admitted on some plan of comprehension. Their arrangements, both for public worship and for academical education, had a provisional character; the intolerance of the times and their differences among themselves prevented their combining to establish a substitute for the University education from which they were excluded. This exclusion was, indeed, the less felt, because in the first age of Dissent there were so many among them who had enjoyed the benefit of an University education. Small and domestic institutions were scattered over the country, in which, though laymen also studied, the education of theologians was the principal object. In the middle of the last century, however, when the hope of re-admission into the Church had died away, a desire arose among the Presbyterians, who were the furthest advanced in general culture and the highest in social position among the Dissenters, to found for themselves a miniature University, where all branches of secular learning should be taught which are not in the narrowest sense professional, along with a learned and liberal theology. Such were the views of the founders of the Warrington Academy, the remote ancestor of our own. At the same time the Dissenters, feeling the injustice of their own exclusion from the national Universities, renewed at intervals, but without success, their attempts to induce the legislature to interfere and abolish or modify the Tests by which they were kept out. I need not enter into the causes which prevented the Dissenters from maintaining permanently and on any large scale an academical institution of their own which should supply to them the place of the share denied them in the

national establishments. But within the last quarter of a century, a new aspect has been assumed by this question. The project of the University of London shewed that there were a large number of persons, not partaking of the special objections of Dissenters, who condemned both the doctrinal tests of Oxford and Cambridge, the obsolete character of their instructions, and their establishment in localities where their advantages could be dispensed only to those who came expressly to seek them. The effect of its establishment was soon felt among the Dissenters, whose thoughts were drawn towards it by its freedom from religious tests, the comprehensiveness of its plans, the celebrity of its teachers' names, and the advantages, real or supposed, of a Metropolitan situation. The diminished resort of lay students to the College at York was the immediate result, and though checked for a time by the errors in the first administration of University College, it returned when these were corrected, and was one principal cause of the decline of that institution, and its removal, in 1840, to Manchester. The attempt which was made on that occasion, with so much munificence and spirit, to provide here a course of instruction, comprehending at once all branches of secular and sacred learning, has had the result which is known to you all. It has been found impossible to attract hither the young laymen of our body, or any considerable number of the same class from this city and its vicinity. Nor was it probable that, when our students had come to consist, with few exceptions, only of our own future ministers, some change should not be desired.

We may regret this state of things, and wish we could recal the time when our whole system of academical education was in our own hands and adapted to our own wants; when freedom of inquiry and the absence of restraints on religious liberty were our exclusive boast. I believe, however, that the counsels of Providence are wiser and more beneficial than our regrets, and that it is our duty, with the sacrifice of individual feelings, to conform to the changes which have been brought about by the irresistible progress of human affairs. When it had come, therefore, to be a generally-admitted truth, that we must in future resort for the means of literary and scientific education for our ministers to some extraneous source, it was obvious to seek the means of bringing together again the two classes of students who had been separated from each other, and educating them in that friendly intercourse, during their academical years, which had been productive of so many beneficial results. Among many opposing arguments for a provincial or a metropolitan place of education for our ministers, I believe this consideration has finally turned the scale in favour of the metropolis.

In regard to the success of the experiment which it has been resolved to make, we have to guard against exaggerated expectations, as well as ungrounded fears. No one can reasonably expect that the transplanted tree should not temporarily suffer by its removal even into a more genial soil. Its fate, in a more distant future, must depend on the condition of the religious body with which our institution is connected. If there be among us a truly religious spirit and life, if our congregations be active and zealous, if the office of a minister be honoured and his labours appreciated, young men will be impelled by benevolent and pious feeling to devote themselves to the work of the ministry, and the means of preparing themselves for it will be cheerfully supplied to them. The

liberal and considerate measures which have been adopted or contemplated for relieving the ministerial profession from some of the difficulties and anxieties which press upon it, deserve all honour and gratitude: but let us not deceive ourselves; they cannot alone preserve us from decay. "They bear not the root, but the root them;" and that root must be the deep-seated influence of religious principle.

After what was said, with so much truth and feeling, by our Chairman at the close of yesterday's proceedings, I think it almost superfluous to repeat the expression of my hope, that the change of place which our College is about to undergo will make no change in the zeal and affection of its supporters. It will retain the name which indicates its origin in the liberality of Manchester, and the wise administration which has placed it on a more secure foundation than any other institution which we possess. The abilities and long-tried character of my friend, to whom its superintendence has been entrusted, are the best guarantee that its great principle will be sacredly observed, and its high character sustained. But human prudence and virtue can only give a fair promise of success; the accomplishment of our wishes and aims must come from a higher source. Let us therefore, before we separate, implore His blessing, who alone can make our work to prosper.

HOW THE ENGLISH CHURCHMAN GETS TO ROME.

It is ever perilous to engage in asserting a truth with a polemical purpose, or in any other spirit than the pure love of truth. The truth will soon be twisted about and distorted, to suit that purpose. We connect our own reputation with it. Our passions cling to it. It swells out to a huge bulk, and absorbs all other truths, or hides them from our view. Thus the partisan is deluded in course of time by his own exaggerations, and grows to believe his own lies. From contending against the extravagances of private judgment, our brethren got to fancy that the only effect of man's intellectual gifts is to lead him into error. From insisting continually upon the value of authority, they got to pine after some absolute authority, which might preserve them from the buffetings of their own loose vagrant thoughts. They began to long for an infallible Church. Hereupon, as so often happens, the wish was father to the thought, that such a Church must needs exist. Then a step further, and he who had thus blinded his intellectual eyes tumbled down the precipice, and fell into the jaws of the dragon at the foot of it. Thus we have heard it argued, that as the Church must needs be infallible, and as the Romish is the only Church which lays claim to infallibility, the Church of Rome must be the true one.—*Archdeacon Hare's Contest with Rome.*

INTELLIGENCE.

YORKSHIRE WEST-RIDING UNITARIAN TRACT AND VILLAGE MISSION SOCIETY.

The annual meeting (thirty-eighth) was this year held at Bradford. Divine service was conducted at Chapel-Lane chapel by Rev. P. Cannon, of Wakefield, and a sermon was preached by Rev. George Armstrong, of Bristol, from Hab. ii. 14, on the nature, meaning and importance of religious controversy in the church. Clear, powerful, and admirably delivered, it was felt at every step to be a most just defence of the necessity of controversy to truth. The meeting at the close of service was shorter than usual, as it was thought the long and interesting report would be better presented after the luncheon. Among the books put on the list, were Miall's Bases of Belief; Binney's "Is it possible to make the Best of both Worlds?" Dr. Godwin's Lectures on Atheism; the Eclipse of Faith; a selection from the Small Books on Great Subjects; and Mr. Wellbeloved's Bible. Another usual resolution having been passed, the meeting adjourned to the Exchange Room, Piccadilly, where about a hundred and twenty ladies and gentlemen sat down to a cold collation with tea and coffee. The attendance from the various places in the Society's district was very good, both town and country. York, Leeds, Wakefield and Dewsbury; Idle, Stanningley, Low Moor and Gomersal; Bradford, Huddersfield, Lydgate and Halifax, were all well, some of them very numerously, represented. In the indisposition of C. H. Dawson, Esq., of Royds' Hall, Edward Swaine, Esq., of Crow Trees, Gomersal, was the Chairman of the day,—the Committee having resolved for the future to vary the old rule of the presidency of the minister of the place. Thos. Hollings, Esq., of Bradford, Joseph Cliffe and Joseph Lupton, Esqrs., of Leeds, and Henry Briggs, Esq., of Outwood Hall, Wakefield, presided at the top and bottom of other tables. At the conclusion of luncheon, the first business was the reading of the reports, by Rev. E. Higginson, Secretary, and Mr. H. C. Briggs, of Outwood Hall, Wakefield, Treasurer.

The Secretary's report gave a very satisfactory view of the missionary, Rev. M. A. Moon's labours, now the chief object of the Society's interest. From his own last quarterly report, embodied in the report now read, it appeared that at four stations, viz., Stanningley, Idle, Pudsey and Windhill-Crag, there had been regular preaching —himself preaching at two stations every Sunday, and the rest being supplied by nine or ten zealous laymen. Low Moor and Bramley had also been visited, the latter with good hope of success. Idle, supported by Mrs. Humble, had just returned to the charge of its former minister, Rev. E. Squire. The society at Darlington was glanced at in connection with a grant of tracts. It was truly stated that the Mission department having become the leading feature of the Society, had caused no diminution of the importance of the Tract department, which, on the contrary, had found an additional sphere of operation in the Mission. The tracts and books issued in 1852 were 4934, at the value of £54. 15*s.* 4½*d.* We were glad to observe that the Society had taken 500 copies of Mr. Madge's admirable Association Sermon a year or two ago, in its cheap form, with other useful tracts of that class. We observed, too, with pleasure, donations of books by Mr. Wellbeloved and Mr. Kenrick; by the former, copies of Cappe's Life of Christ; Letters to Archdeacon Wrangham; Sermon, "Unitarians not guilty of denying the Lord that bought them;"—by the latter, copies of his father's Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament. The Treasurer's report was equally encouraging with that of the Secretary; when printed, it will be seen in what quarters the Society is indebted for aid. From the Secretary's report, which will also be printed, we content ourselves at present with making one extract:

"Under the separate arrangement for Idle, your missionary will be the more free for effort in some of the many other places that invite his attention from all sides, where the fields stand white for harvest, and only need able and zealous labourers to find occasion for doing infinite good. The comfortable outward condition of the manual working classes is an especial encouragement to efforts for their moral and religious good, as such efforts are always received with less favour, if not felt to be less gracious in the making, when sharp poverty and political discontent are the atmosphere of the daily life. The better state of

things now prevalent under the restored reign of the beneficent natural laws of Providence, as regards industry and trade, is a clear call upon those who are rejoicing in it to advance themselves and their families in the scale of humanity and religion, and thus truly to 'glorify God at once in their bodies and spirits, which are His.'"

In moving the adoption of the report, Darnton Lupton, Esq., of Leeds, thought there was some want of zeal and interest in our laity, not the right sort of preaching among our ministers, and that liturgies would best express the wants of congregations in prayer.

Thomas Todd, Esq., of Dewsbury, in seconding it, while admitting some justice in Mr. Lupton's remarks, still thought our religion, if not loud in profession, was, as Mr. L. seemed to admit, both in our hearts and lives. He hoped a better provision for ministers was going on—alluded to large and liberal movements among the laity—was highly pleased with the reports read, and hoped that the lateness with which we had taken the missionary field, would be made up by present zeal and earnestness.

What had been intended for the morning meeting having now been disposed of, the sentiments of the afternoon followed; and having proposed "The Queen," and "Civil and Religious Liberty," the Chairman called on Rev. W. Turner, of Halifax, to propose the thanks of the meeting to the gentlemen who had conducted the religious services of the occasion. High as had been his expectations of the preacher (Mr. Turner said), they had been exceeded; and his subject he thought peculiarly appropriate to the present tendency to undervalue *truth* as compared with sentiment. Justly discriminating controversy from a hostile spirit, he moved the cordial thanks of the meeting to Mr. Armstrong, who had so ably set before them its nature and importance. With him he had great pleasure in joining Mr. Cannon in the acknowledgment.

Joseph Cliffe, Esq., of Leeds, seconded the motion, and suggested the great contentment of Unitarians with their views as a reason why they did not prompt them to greater missionary exertion. He thought, however, a better knowledge entailed a more solemn responsibility.

Rev. George Armstrong was not prepared for so indulgent a reception, and was afraid he should have incurred the blame of a "long logical sermon," yet he thought logic should be joined with earnestness on the greatest of themes. In allusion to "the emancipated industry" of the report, he considered Unitarians the most inexcusable of monopolists if they kept unshared the inestimable riches God had poured into their lap. If content with their views for the next world, they should at least have compassion on this, and put an end to the alienation so abundantly produced by false systems of religion. In illustration, he adverted to the British and Foreign School Society, the exposure of whose injustice had been brought up to ripeness—it needed but to be a little more shaken to cause it to drop. Mr. A. adverted with high praise to Mr. Wicksteed's sermon, entitled, "The Englishman's Duty to the Free and Enslaved American," and to Mr. Kenrick's recent paper on the First Communion of the Young; and, in conclusion, recommended the Religious Tract Society's publication entitled, "The Threefold Cord, containing a Precept, Prayer and Promise for every Day in the Year."

Rev. J. Kenrick, having been appealed to by Mr. Armstrong, adverted, in reply, to a tract by Mr. A. on the subject of his own paper. He had found great harmony of feeling in connection with it. It was not without great deliberation that he had fixed on the first Sunday in the year as the best day for the first communion of young persons. Among the Unitarian churches, the evil was not of too great control, but of too great laxity—too great a want of uniformity. The more we could approach in worship and usages to an uniform system, the greater would be the strength of our communion. He must be allowed to express his cordial concurrence with the friends who had spoken before him, in gratitude to the preacher of the day, for his very admirable defence of free discussion (although bearing the obnoxious name of controversy) with a view to religious truth. Mr. Armstrong's predecessors, as Carpenter, Rowe, Estlin, were men most zealous for the Unitarian doctrine, at a time, too, when it was far more obnoxious to profess Unitarianism than it is now.

Rev. P. Cannon acknowledged the compliment paid him. He thought Easter the most suitable time for young persons first joining in the Lord's Supper.

In proposing the "West-Riding Unitarian Tract and Village Mission Soci-

ety, and its Secretary," Mr. ARMSTRONG recommended the Liturgy as lately published by Pickering, to be added to the catalogue. This gave rise to remarks by the CHAIRMAN and Rev. JOHN OWEN, of Lydgate, before Rev. E. HIGGINSON, as Secretary, rose to reply. He first adverted to liturgies, of the success of which he had doubts. Dissenting habits were against them, and good music and some cost were indispensable, and, above all, a common consent. Mr. Higginson then controverted Mr. D. Lupton's charge of want of zeal among the laity and ministers, premising on the badness of the habit of blaming ourselves into which we were falling. He thought what had been done lately at Leeds, Wakefield, Halifax,—what was doing so vigorously at Huddersfield, and what was now intended at Bradford for the improvement of the chapel to meet the rapid growth of the town, rather proved the contrary. He concluded with proposing the best thanks of the meeting to Mr. Moon and his coadjutors in the Mission. Mr. Squire, Mr. Hall, Mr. Phillips, were all present.

Rev. M. A. MOON, in reply, believed the Mission would have growing claims on the Society. There might be twenty missionary stations were there men to fill them. In combination with his labours, he had great faith in the promotion of all useful institutions and salutary amusements for the people.

Rev. J. KENRICK then proposed "The Minister and Congregation of the Bradford Chapel," and was sorry it came on so late in the afternoon. His recollection went back to the ministry of Mr. Dean, who was succeeded by his excellent and too early snatched away college friend and afterwards pupil, Mr. H. Turner. He was pleased, from his long knowledge of and great regard for the present minister, to be the means of expressing what he was sure was the general feeling. He thought what had passed that afternoon would have a most beneficial effect on the congregation.

Rev. J. H. RYLAND acknowledged the kindness of Mr. Kenrick and the meeting. Notwithstanding all our criticisms, he believed there was good ground of hope. Not that he supposed that pure Christianity would ever be the most forward and conspicuous thing in this world, or that our zeal should be unduly directed to externals. The society with which he had been connected for nearly ten years, had, within his ministry, provided for Sunday-school accommodation. Other allusions also had been made to the very liberal contributions of its members to our public objects. General society offered great scope, in which he had met with cordial co-operation from all denominations. He trusted the intended improvements of their chapel would be a great aid,—was glad to have witnessed so large a meeting that day, and hoped it would be of great benefit to them as a congregation.

Mr. PHILLIPS, of Leeds, a coadjutor of Mr. Moon, spoke of the greater difficulties encountered in the villages, and thought if town ministers would occasionally exchange with the missionary, great good would ensue.

Mr. RYLAND and Mr. HIGGINSON agreed to the suggestion, and mentioned the hope entertained of holding a social meeting at Stanningley during the summer.

JOSEPH LUPTON, Esq., of Leeds, on proposing a resolution on American Slavery, regretted the absence of Mr. Wicksteed, and would individually have wished the resolution stronger, but to ensure unanimity brought forward the following:

"That this meeting, in the same spirit in which, two years ago, the assembled friends of the Society recorded their 'sorrowful surprise' at the then 'fresh effort made in the United States' to perpetuate Slavery 'by means of the Fugitive Slave Law,' and their 'grief and shame' to see the observance of that Law advocated by 'professors and ministers of the Gospel of Christ,'—is now impelled to cast its glance sadly, yet trustfully, upon the same dark page of human life. Believing that all true Christians must desire and anticipate, and ought, according to their opportunities and powers, to labour for, the extinction of Slavery wherever it exists, we gladly hail the rapid growth of public opinion on the subject, as distinctly marked by the production, and widely promoted by the diffusion, of that true and powerful book, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. That we rely upon the growth of Christian opinion and Christian feeling on both sides of the Atlantic, to bring this question more and more rapidly to its solution, with the aid of those great Providential agencies which shew Slavery to be an accursed as well as a sinful thing; and without presuming to judge or condemn those whose plans of abolition may be more rapid or more gradual than our own, we would give our sympathy and good wishes, and, so

far as we can, our aid, to all well-advised plans for emancipation, and say God speed! to the emancipators."

Rev. E. Higginson seconded the resolution, and it was carried unanimously.

After some remarks by Dr. Bateman, Rev. J. K. Montgomery, the Secretary and others, the following resolution, proposed by J. Lupton, Esq., and seconded by Rev. E. Hall, of Leeds, was also passed:

"That the foregoing resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of this Society to the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, London; and to Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, New York, for presentation to the American Unitarian Association."

A vote of thanks to the Chairman, proposed by Mr. E. J. Morton, of Halifax, and seconded by Rev. J. H. Ryland, concluded the business of the day.

CONFERENCE ON THE SUBJECT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

At a special meeting of the Non-subscribing Ministers' Conversation Society, held the 19th May, convened by advertisement, inviting the attendance of country ministers, there were present, the Revds. T. B. W. Briggs; W. D. Jeremy, of Northampton; E. Kell, of Newport; G. Kenrick; J. C. Lunn, of King's Lynn; R. E. B. Maclellan, of Canterbury; D. Maginnis, of Belfast; T. L. Marshall, of Hackney; S. Martin, of Trowbridge; J. C. Means, of Chatham; E. Parry, of Battle; R. Shaen, of Dudley; H. Solly; E. Talbot, of Tenterden; Messrs. Colfox, of Bridport; H. E. Howse, of Frenchay; and the Secretary.

Rev. George Kenrick presided, and commenced by observing that the meeting was called to consider a subject of great importance, and to which some attention had recently been directed. The evil that they wished to remove was apparent to them all, and had long been felt. When the service of the Lord's Supper is about to be administered, the great body of the congregations rise from their seats and quit the chapel, very few remaining to attend the Communion. Now why is this? Is it because there is any unpleasant solemnity attached to the service? No; he did not think that was the case. There must be a cause somewhere. If the ministers have omitted to inculcate the proper feeling in favour of the Communion, it is in some respect their fault, and it is necessary that they should search out the source of the mischief, and endeavour to remove it. He agreed with some admirable remarks in a letter by Rev. George Armstrong, presented at the half-yearly meeting of the Western Unitarian Christian Union, in which he recommends that members of our congregations on arriving at years of maturity should take part in some service analogous to the Church institution of Confirmation. Respecting it he said,—"Two constituents to this act would obviously occur to most minds, as contributing essentially to its efficiency and impression. First, in each congregation, a due notice by the minister of the time and place when and where such an assembly would be held, with suitable arrangements by him, willingly seconded by the objects of his care, for intermediate preparation, whether by reading, conversation, correspondence, or in such other form and manner as might be mutually most agreeable and convenient. And, secondly, notification that an appropriate service would solemnize the occasion;—to close with the administration of the Lord's Supper."

He also read the following suggestion by the Rev. John Kenrick, which, although published after the letter just quoted had appeared, yet was written, he believed, without his brother having had any knowledge of that letter:

"It is not the purpose of this paper either to prove that the amount and regularity of this attendance are not such as to give favourable indications of the religious state of our societies, or to inquire into all the causes which have produced the present state of things. The former attempt would be superfluous, because the fact falls under every minister's observation; the latter would be indefinite, and the inquiry, though interesting and important, could scarcely be rendered practical. I confine myself to one cause and one remedy.

"Any one who notices the class of persons who compose the communicants in our congregations, must have observed how few of the younger members it includes. Many appear to defer communion till they reach middle life, or become heads of families themselves, or till they occupy a station in the society which seems to impose on them the duty of setting an example to others. I attribute this delay, which often issues in the entire neglect of communion through life, in great mea-

sure to the want of some rule or usage (among us *a rule* can be nothing more than a sanctioned usage) by which some definite time should be fixed for the commencement of the practice. However much the act of communion may be divested of the terrors in which superstition has clothed it, the young will always regard it with some degree of apprehension. It is a more distinct act of personal religion than attendance on public worship; from the manner of its performance it appears to be something which may be omitted without mutilation of the ordinary service; and under the influence of these opposite feelings, both the seriously disposed and the more indifferent hesitate and delay. They want the impelling force which should overcome these obstacles; they want some motive to begin that which, if begun, would in all probability be persevered in.

"It is to supply this motive that I could wish our ministers, in concert with their congregations, to fix some definite time when the young should be invited to become communicants. In the Church of England, confirmation must precede communion; but it appears to be left afterwards to those who desire it, to signify their wish to be admitted to the Lord's Table. When I was better acquainted with the religious usages of Scotland than I am now, a degree of discredit attached to the neglect of communion, which secured the attendance of both sexes when they came to maturity. In the continental churches most nearly allied to our own, it is regarded as the parent's duty, when the child approaches manhood, to introduce him anew into the Christian church, by bringing him to communion, and courses of religious instruction are given by the pastors with a special view to preparation for this duty.

"Seeing how much its neglect among us is caused by a reluctance to begin, I attach considerable importance to the establishment of a definite time when the young should join in their first communion. And upon the whole the *first Sunday of the year* appears the most suitable for this purpose. The solemnity of the season, when all who exercise any insight into their own character, or reflection upon their own actions, endeavour to cast off bad habits, and make a step forward in their religious as they are doing in their natural life, suits well with the profession of personal faith in the gospel, and the desire to live according to its precepts. It is a time when exhortations of more than usual earnestness are heard from the pulpit, to consider the relation in which we stand to eternity, and when the mind is naturally more impressed with the value of that Revelation which has brought life and immortality to light. In this view it may be thought that one of the great festivals of the Christian year would be more appropriate—Christmas, Easter or Whitsuntide. But the first only occasionally falls on a Sunday, Easter and Whitsuntide only occasionally on the first Sunday of the month, which is generally appropriated to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and inconvenience might arise from breaking through the rule. Were any other than the first Sunday of the year fixed for a first communion, undoubtedly Easter would have the best claim, as most intimately connected with the characteristic events of the Gospel history.

"Supposing, then, the first Sunday of the year to be adopted, I propose that it be further established as a usage of our congregations, that in the beginning of the month of October the minister should call upon those members of his flock, in whose families there are young persons of a suitable age to become communicants, and receive their names, to be formed into a class who should attend him weekly for the purpose of receiving religious instruction specially adapted to prepare them for joining in the rite. This season of the year appears convenient for the purpose. Families dispersed during the summer, in pursuit of health or pleasure, commonly re-assemble in the autumn, and between October and Christmas a sufficient time might be found for the required instruction. The age may be approximately fixed at seventeen for daughters and eighteen for sons; it might be earlier if they were about to leave home to settle at a distance, as it is very important that the habit should be formed before removal into a new connection.

"To suggest what should be the nature of the instruction conveyed or the mode of communicating it, would be an interference with the discretion of each individual minister. There is no fear that in our denomination it should be perverted to a dogmatic purpose, or made the means of imposing a creed. But it might afford an opportunity of opening more fully the nature of Chris-

tianity, of removing doubts and confirming faith by more systematic instruction than can be given from the pulpit, and more familiar intercourse than a series of lectures would allow. Whether there be in existence any manual or compendium which could be advantageously employed for this purpose, I do not know; but if called for, I have no doubt it would speedily be furnished. And if the plan which I have recommended should become, what I desire to see it, a fixed usage in our churches, and a regular part of the duty of our ministers, those who undertake to prepare them for their office would no doubt direct their special attention to this point.

"I believe that every minister will acknowledge the diminished and diminishing attendance on the Communion to be one of the painful discouragements of his office. It may be that we have ourselves neglected to enforce the duty, or even have thought too lightly of its importance, as a link which connects us with that Primitive Christianity which we aim to restore, and that Universal Church of which we claim to be members. It is not probable, however, judging from past experience, that those who are most convinced of its value will produce any great effect by mere exhortations from the pulpit. What seems to be wanting is the early formation of the habit, and the adoption of some means to secure, that to every adult member of our congregations instruction in the duty, the significance and the practical value of joining in this ordinance, shall at least have been offered.

"There is no authority among us by which uniformity of religious usage can be established; yet the importance of such uniformity, when it can be attained without a sacrifice of liberty, must be evident. Independently of its benefit to our own religious state, it would place us in a more favourable relation to other Christian communities, who would see that Christian profession is the true bond of our union. It may be hoped, however, that harmony of conviction, aided by the weight of individual character and experience, may supply the place of Church authority. Should these suggestions be approved by those to whom they are submitted, and the plan proposed be adopted by them in their own congregations, and recommended to their brethren in the ministry in other parts of England, it is probable that many would be willing to adopt their recommendation and follow their example."

The Chairman thought that a cause for the non-attendance at the Lord's Supper arose from the length of the previous service. Many of the country members came from long distances to their chapels, and returned home as soon as possible, without being able to spare sufficient time for the Communion; and he therefore thought there should be a separate service for which all would come prepared.

Mr. Means suggested that, before commencing the conversation, each minister should mention how many communicants he had, and what was the number of his congregation. This suggestion was complied with. [We have received a detailed account of these statements, but they bear internal evidence of not having been designed for the public eye. We therefore suppress this portion of the report.]

The Chairman said the statements made by the several ministers proved that the causes of complaint were more numerous than he had supposed. He invited the ministers present to suggest a remedy.

Mr. Solly considered that as a body we wanted more church life. In other religious denominations too much attention was paid to forms, but this was not the case with Unitarians, and the neglect had proved very injurious. Meetings were very desirable for the sustenance of church life, whether as meetings of Sunday-school teachers, district visitors, prayer and scripture meetings, the Communion service, confirmation services, or congregational tea meetings. The meeting on the present occasion was a church-fellowship meeting, and some good, he hoped, would result from their labours. He attached great value to forms in religion, if they arose from earnest internal feeling; but where they did not, they were lifeless and useless. In a Sunday-school, sometimes the teacher attends at first indifferently, working on simply because he has committed himself to it; but afterwards his feelings become interested in his work, and his religious life becomes bound up with it; and so it often is with other forms. Religion is intimately connected with the feelings and sentiments which are peculiarly fluctuating and indefinite, and consequently nothing is more required than forms to fix and sustain them. He quoted with approbation a passage from the letter of Mr. Arm-

strong recommending the adoption by Unitarian churches of some form analogous to the Church-of-England rite of confirmation, and designed to express the deliberate assumption of the Christian profession and a religious character. If a young person is required at a certain period of life to give a definite explanation of anything, it promotes thought and impresses the subject in a more forcible manner than if it simply comes under observation in the ordinary course of teaching. The early church paid great attention to proselytes. For three years, whether children or adults, they were obliged to be catechumens; after this period, they made a declaration, in the presence of the church, of their faith in Christ, were baptized, and then admitted to the Lord's Supper. Persons who had thus passed through the trials of preparatory training and discipline, were in after life better able to endure their fiery trials. The Sunday-school should always be connected with a catechetical class preparing for communion, and if greater pains were taken to interest the older scholars in this ceremony, and to induce them to join it at a proper age, we should not so often hear the question asked, "How are we to attach our Sunday scholars to our congregations?" He confessed he did not like the communicants to sit apart in their pews, but would much prefer their sitting together at a table. This separate system had a very chilling and unbrotherly effect upon many minds, and he knew that it repelled some serious Christians from partaking of the Lord's Supper. He thought this a very insufficient reason for staying away, but he felt it right to advert to the fact. Our forms must be made suitable to the spirit. A distinct service for the Communion was surrounded by difficulties. He certainly should not secure a proper attendance in the afternoon. There were very few of his morning congregation that ever came out even to the evening service. Those who object to the service once a month, as too frequent a repetition of it, appeared to him to view it rather as a mere stimulant to the religious life, than as a part of its regular nourishment, which he believed it was intended to be. He was certain that preaching was not sufficient alone for the spiritual life either of individuals or the church, and that forms are valuable and necessary for the sustenance of that life. In conclusion, he moved the following resolution: "That this meeting cordially approves of Rev. John Kenrick's excellent suggestion for increasing the attendance on the Lord's Supper, and the ministers present cordially recommend his plan for adoption throughout the kingdom."

Mr. Kell seconded the resolution, and thought, with Mr. Solly, that more church life was wanted, and that with it we might become a more flourishing body. Piety should be cultivated in our own hearts, and that would soon lead to increased attendance on the Lord's Supper. We should have prayer in our families and our congregational meetings, and even such a meeting as the present should not commence or terminate without prayer.—The resolution passed unanimously.

Mr. W. D. Jeremy considered that we could not act on the suggestion of Mr. Kenrick without some plan to break the ice. He had seen an admirable article in the Christian Reformer upon Bunsen's Life of Hippolytus, explaining the practice of the early Christians.

Mr. S. Martin thought that a pioneer was wanted, and inquired whether there was any good, cheap tract that was suited to circulate on the subject.

Mr. Solly offered to submit to the Christian Tract Society any resolution that might be approved, respecting the need of a tract on the Lord's Supper.

Mr. Means observed that he did not think the suggestion of Mr. Kenrick fully met their difficulties. It was chiefly directed to the young, whereas the need was to cherish religious life generally. In the course of their congregational experience, they all felt the want of something with which to impress the minds of the young on entering life, and also of those of any age when they first turned to the Lord with all their heart, and he could recommend nothing more suitable than the scriptural rite of Baptism. They wanted to guard against indifference. When our young people grow up serious and religious, he thought it comparatively no evil if they quitted our body to unite seriously with other sects; but they too often quit our services for a state of irreligious indecision. Some people term themselves Adult Baptists, and think that those who adopt it when young—say from nine or ten years of age upwards—do not derive benefit. In this he did not agree, and thought it was important to begin as early as possible, even at twelve or thirteen years of age.

Mr. PARRY considered it very desirable that we should agree to some practical resolution in furtherance of the object of the meeting. Much valuable information had been furnished, but they were very far from a general result. It was necessary to disseminate right views respecting the Lord's Supper. There was a notion amongst the laity that they ought not to partake of it unless they were much better people. This view he ably controverted. He admitted, he said, that the ministers themselves did not administer it in the best possible manner. They found apathy on the part of the communicants, and they caught their coldness. It was important that there should be more definite and popular views respecting the Lord's Supper. He proposed that Mr. Solly and Mr. Kenrick be requested to ascertain what good popular tracts there were on the nature of the Lord's Supper, and to report to the next meeting.

The resolution was agreed to, and Mr. S. Martin concluded with prayer.

REV. CHAS. BERRY AND THE LEICESTER BOARD OF GUARDIANS.

By an unopposed, if not unanimous vote of the Guardians, Mr. Berry's name has been added to the list of chaplains at the Union workhouse. Dr. Legge has published a long letter in the *Leicestershire Mercury* in defence of himself and the other "Evangelical" Dissenting ministers, in which he begins by admitting that he does not like his position, and concludes by expressing his opinion that a chaplaincy on the voluntary principle will not work well, and recommends the Guardians to relieve all parties from further annoyance by appointing a paid chaplain. Dr. Legge substantially admits the correctness of Mr. Berry's statement. "We did assert," he says, speaking of the meeting at the Town Library, "that the Truth which is the burthen of our ministry is with us no fast and loose affair, but the life of our life. It did strike us that the ministry in the workhouse of gentlemen whose theories of Christianity were apparently in irreconcilable antagonism, was not in itself a seemly or a reasonable thing; and we did express what we felt, that the scheme was likely to raise an outcry among the thoughtful religious public out of doors against it, and would to a dead certainty (!) lead to its suppression by the authorities in high places." Of latitudinarians the Dr. expresses his opinion thus: "I am well aware that there are those who make no account of religious differences—doctrines, dogmas, formulas and so forth; whose creed, 'if creed it can be called that creed is none,' is chameleon in hue and elastic in tissue as that of the author of the Universal Prayer, 'Jehovah, Jove or Lord.'"

Against Mr. Berry, Dr. Legge, while professing much respect, flings the accusation of bigotry and intolerance! and says, that whilst his words are smoother than oil, "something very different from oil was in his heart." In remarking on Mr. Berry's claim to be regarded as much an "Evangelical" as the other Dissenting ministers of Leicester, Dr. Legge says he himself might with equal propriety claim to be called a Unitarian. After attempting to dispute Mr. Berry's statement respecting the Unitarianism of Dr. Watts, the Dr. somewhat magniloquently declares—"I cannot think *that* a good cause or a holy, which, to serve its purposes, must ghoul-like wander among the tombs, and pollute the memorials of the honoured dead."

In respect to Mr. Berry's early orthodoxy, Dr. Legge says—"There were those recently alive whom I have heard speak of the evangelical beauty and unction of his discourses during the first six weeks of his advent in Leicester." He draws a distinction between the Unitarianism of Belsham and of Channing, intimating that the latter is not so very far removed from "rectitude," a word which he uses apparently for truth or right doctrine.

To Dr. Legge's effusion, Mr. Berry has made no reply, and none was needed. An unsuccessful attempt has since been made in the Board of Guardians to return to the system of a paid Church-of-England chaplain. The religious opinions of the present inmates have been ascertained. Out of 211, there are 90 Church of England, 20 Baptists, 14 Methodists, 11 Roman Catholics, 3 Independents, 1 Unitarian, 20 unknown; the rest are infants and harmless insane persons. It has been arranged that the services shall be conducted on the Sunday afternoons by the several Dissenting ministers whose services have been offered and accepted, in the order of their appointment. Any members of the Church of England objecting to attend the service, shall be allowed to go to church, accompanied by the porter. Roman Catholic inmates

are to be allowed to attend their own place of worship. The clergy of the Church of England are to have free access to the members of their Church between nine and twelve, and Dissenting ministers to have similar liberty to the persons in their respective communions between two and five. We hope, notwithstanding Dr. Legge's prophecy of failure, that a scheme framed in a spirit of justice and candour, may work successfully. The clergy of Leicester will surely see the impropriety of their refusal to take part in the workhouse services. We have been induced to give a full narrative of the proceedings in this curious case, because it has more than a local importance. It illustrates the strange position of religious parties in this country—the exclusiveness of the clergy, and their indisposition to labour without pay—the inconsistency of "Evangelical" Dissenting ministers. In the opposite scale, we may be permitted to place and to regard with satisfaction the catholicism and moral courage in breasting and rebuking bigotry of an Unitarian minister, and the good sense and liberality of the Leicester Guardians in their final arrangement of the spiritual instruction of the inmates of the Union workhouse.

IMPORTANT ACCESSION TO THE UNITARIAN RANKS.

Our readers have doubtless seen in the newspapers some of the paragraphs relating to the secession from the "orthodox" Congregational body of the Rev. William Forster. Of these paragraphs, we select two from the London *Examiner* of June 11th and 18th:

"*Secession from Evangelical Principles.* Considerable excitement has been caused in Evangelical circles by the open renunciation of their distinguishing principles by one of their most popular ministers, the Rev. Mr. Forster, the pastor of a numerous congregation, assembling in a handsome modern-built edifice in Kentish Town. The Rev. gentleman has announced his farewell sermon to be preached to his present congregation on Sunday next. A large portion of his hearers, it is said, sympathize with their minister's new views, and will accompany him to another place of worship in the neighbourhood. Rumour makes free with the names of other men of note in the Evangelical world as being likely to follow this gentleman's example. *(Morning Paper.)* We have been informed that Mr. Forster intends establishing a Free Christian Church, the bases of which will be—The Holy Scriptures, not human creeds, the only standard of Christian belief; the duty of all men to inquire for themselves; their individual irresponsibility to each other for the conclusions which they may reach; and diversity of opinions no bar to religious fellowship. In this project he has received ample promise of support."—*Examiner*, June 11.

"*Evangelical Dissent—Scriptural Truth.* A large and over-crowded meeting was held on Tuesday last, in Hart's Rooms, Camden Town, of those who sympathize with the new views as recently expounded by the Rev. William Forster, the highly popular preacher belonging to the Congregational body in Kentish Town. Several gentlemen addressed the assembly on the importance of this movement viewed in relation to Christian fellowship generally, evidencing that the various creeds or dogmas, of whatever sect, as at present upheld, tended in no small measure to alienate many from the church, and were mainly the cause of the masses keeping aloof from the worship of the Most High. It was justly urged, that the spread of truth and of the Bible did not keep pace with the strides of education and intelligence, and that the time had arrived when a vigorous and healthy aspect of revealed religion should be preached to the multitude. Resolutions were passed expressive of concurrence in these objects, and the meeting pledged itself to co-operate with Mr. Forster in the establishment of a Free Christian Church, capable of holding a thousand persons. In the mean time, accommodation has been secured for future worship."—*Examiner*, June 18.

Mr. Forster was, we believe, educated at Hoxton Academy. He was formerly settled at West Bromwich, near Birmingham. He had then a reputation for liberality, and we are informed by one who has watched his progress with interest that he has always sustained that reputation. His pulpit labours, both in Warwickshire and in the neighbourhood of London, have been attractive and successful. His pulpit compositions are said to bear marks of thoughtful preparation. His delivery is sustained and impressive. His devotional services are described to us as being earnest and affecting. From Warwickshire, we believe he removed to Highgate, and thence, about 1847, to Kentish Town, where a large and handsome chapel has been erected for him at a cost of about £6000. He became at the same time a member of

the Congregational Board, which we suppose may be taken in proof of his being then held in high estimation by the metropolitan leaders of the Congregational party. In 1846, he printed an animated appeal to Sunday-school Teachers on their Duties in relation to State Churches. An extract or two from this and another publication, entitled "Christian Obligation," will shew the popular and effective style of Mr. Forster:

"*Reverence for 'the Truth' ought to induce you to teach Dissent.* Truth is one. All the parts of truth are important. If any portion be suppressed, or mutilated, all the rest will suffer with it. This is eminently the case with religious truth. Hence the necessity of clearing the mind of all prejudices and sinister motives in order to contemplate the broad and bright aspect of truth with 'an eye which is single, that the whole body may be full of light.' There is a strong tendency in the human mind to subject truth to considerations of expediency, to work up, like an artisan, those parts of it which may be used for present and personal profit, and to cast the rest away as rubbish, or lay it up as lumber, because it cannot be made to serve selfish and short-sighted ends. Those who do this 'sell the truth.' This tampering with a due reverence for 'the truth' is far more common than some would suppose. If to gain the favour of man, if to ward off persecution, if to preserve peace, great practical principles are put in abeyance, and earnest religious convictions are suppressed, then is truth irreverently bartered away, and an unworthy artifice adopted, to escape one of the consequences of our Lord's mission: 'I came not to send peace upon earth, but a sword.'"

"*You must teach Dissent by means of historic examples.* Glorious are the traditions of Nonconformity! Spirit-stirring are the associations hovering over its old meeting-houses! Thrilling are the historic recollections of its noble confessors! You have it in your power to make the hearts of the children beat high with lofty sentiments, and their eyes run over with a genuine sympathy, by telling them of the sufferings of our ancestors. In this way, you will call up around you, from past times of peril and persecution, the shades of those good and great men who suffered the loss of liberty, property, country, home, and often life itself, for conscience' sake; and you can recount their wrongs, and woes, and cheerful trust in God, that they being dead may yet teach in your classes the immortal principles for which they suffered the loss of all things."

Power of Faith.

"*We should have firm faith in the cause which we strive to promote.* Faith is the root of all activity. It sets the whole machinery of the mind in motion. The husbandman has faith in the sun, the rain, the atmosphere, the soil, the seed-corn. It is this which makes him spend his time, energies, and property on the cultivation of his farm, and leads him to cast the grain into the bosom of the faithful and generous earth. It is faith in the ship, the compass, the chart, the sea, the wind, and the crew, which induces the emigrant to venture his life, the lives of his family, and all he has in the world, on the stormy ocean, in quest of a new home in a far distant land. It is faith in the human faculties, in the power of letters, in the meaning of words, in the relation of figures, which prompts the teacher to impart literary and mathematical knowledge to the opening mind of youth. It is faith in the inalienable rights of man, in the principles of eternal justice, in the inborn, insuppressible, struggling spirit of liberty, in the force of moral principles, in the power of argument, and in the final destinies of all democracies, which emboldens the patriot to risk life and limb in the cause of his country's deliverance from the iron grasp of the oppressor. Time would fail me to give an adequate list of the examples of the prodigious power there is in faith. It is the spirit in the wheels of human agency. When it moves, they revolve—when it stands, they are still—when it languishes, they are slow—when it is energetic, they are rapid in their course."

A more recent publication by Mr. Forster, a sermon occasioned by the death of the Duke of Wellington, received the compliment of a notice in the columns of the *Examiner*.

A few weeks ago it came to our knowledge that Mr. Forster had been engaged in a long and anxious examination into the scripture foundations of the "orthodox" system which he had hitherto received. An intelligent Unitarian correspondent was a hearer of his on Sunday, May 29, and thus reported to us the interesting result of Mr. Forster's inquiries:

"I heard Mr. Forster again yesterday morning: it was a completely *Unitarian* sermon, from the words, 'Christ is God's' —'not,' were his first words after this text,—'not God, but God's.' He wished,

he said, that there should be no misunderstanding of his present views, which he had arrived at by a diligent study of the Scriptures, chapter by chapter, verse by verse, sentence by sentence, word by word. That had taught him that Christ was a man, in all respects, naturally, like unto his brethren. Possessing no inherent power, he became the Christ by being anointed with the Holy Spirit. Where would have been the use of so anointing him, if previously he had possessed all power? If his hearers would search the Scriptures for themselves, they would at once see the absurdity of regarding Christ as God. He brought the usual array of texts in support of his new views, which he said he had good reason to believe were entertained by many of the best minds in 'orthodox' churches, whose real views were hid in the jargon of established creeds. He exhorted his hearers to examine for themselves, and not defer to the teaching of creeds or catechisms, or to the dictum of divinity tutors."

The trust-deed of the Congregational church of Kentish Town is, we are informed, exceedingly liberal, and under it Mr. Forster might have continued to occupy the pulpit, notwithstanding the change of his religious sentiments. But he exercised, we think, a sound discretion in thinking that, though legally empowered to remain, morally he was bound to resign the office, to which he had been elected under circumstances so different from those by which he is now surrounded. Accordingly, on Sunday last he preached by announcement his farewell sermons. We are indebted to the same friendly pen which reported the previous discourse, for an account of these addresses:

"Taking for his text, 1 Tim. ii. 5, 'For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,' Mr. Forster commenced by declaring that, as far as he could recollect, he had never before ventured to preach from this passage, which required more ingenuity than he could command to make it harmonize with popular notions of faith. With his present views, the text appeared plain and consistent enough. First, it declared that there is one God. On the authority of an apostle it was proclaimed that God is One —one in essence, in nature, and in perfections. Nature confirmed this truth. Everything bears the stamp of one and the same Mind. The oneness of God lay at the very foundation of Mosaic morality, and was proclaimed in sharp contrast to the plurality of Heathen gods. If there be a Trinity, it is clear that Moses and the patriarchs knew nothing of the awful truth, although on its belief, as we are now told, human salvation depends. Neither was it known to Christ and his apostles, who were never charged with introducing any novelty with regard to the Divine Nature. If Christ had been proclaimed to the Jews as God the Son, coequal with the Father, the whole Jewish nation would have been convulsed. Christ prayed to God. In answer to the question, 'Whom say ye that I am?' Simon answered, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'—not, God himself. It had been said that Christ did not plainly reveal his real dignity, lest the Jews should have been deterred from crucifying him. This was to say that the Saviour had entrapped the Jews, and forbore to tell the whole truth. So plainly did Christ and the apostles teach the Unity of God, that the concoctors of a Trinity were at their wits' end to account for it. If three objects of worship were not polytheism, there never was polytheism in the world. Just as easy to reduce all the gods of the heathen into one God, as the three Gods of the Athanasian Creed.—The apostle teaches that Jesus Christ is a man—'the man,' not the God-man, 'Christ Jesus.' As plainly taught the Saviour himself—'Ye seek to kill me, a man who hath told you the truth that he hath heard of the Father.' It was clear that God and Christ were as distinct as a king and his ambassador. Christ was a divinely-constituted man, possessing a soul and body like other men, and subject to the same laws of pleasure and pain. Fire would have burnt him, water would have drowned him, starvation would have killed him, just as, at last, crucifixion deprived him of life. In all respects was he 'made like unto his brethren.' Some passages, which seem to teach his pre-existence, were, the preacher thought, reconcilable with his being simply and naturally the child of Mary.—The office of Jesus was that of 'Mediator,' a term applied to Moses, and which carries with it its own meaning. It designates one who goes between two parties. Christ did not pretend to reconcile God to man. No! his object was to bring men to God by presenting Him to them in the character of a Father. This view of Christ as a Mediator was simple, rational, scriptural. Nature was a Mediator by proclaiming God's goodness. The orthodox scheme made Christ better than God. These were his views—very heterodox, he knew, they were esteemed; but not the less rational, scriptural and true. The design of the teaching of Jesus

Christ was to make men agents of good in this world, and fit for heaven in the next. To suppose that Christ came to appease the wrath of God, to pay a penalty due to his justice, was repugnant to every just idea of God's character and a sound morality. Who dare imitate the orthodox God, who would not forgive till full payment was made to his justice—ample satisfaction to his vengeance? Such a God is not the God of our Lord Jesus Christ—not the God of Paul. 'By grace ye are saved.' How by *grace*, if the last farthing was paid by an unoffending sufferer? His present views of the gospel he had adopted after long and patient examination—views he meant to live by and, he hoped, to die in. Whilst retaining what he believed to be true, he had discarded human dogmas cried up as orthodoxy. He wanted his hearers to examine for themselves—not to adopt his views without due inquiry. With their Bible and the common-sense and mother-wit that God had given them, they could hardly fail in an honest search after truth. The orthodox system turned God into a cipher. Christ is made the end, and not the way to the end. To such orthodox views he said, Farewell for ever! Cost what it might, he had made up his mind to proclaim his present views to his countrymen whenever the opportunity was afforded him. They were not new views. Long had they been entertained by a body of men much calumniated and misrepresented. Whilst bishops, and priests, and deacons, and churches, had acknowledged God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, a small but faithful band had proclaimed, 'To us there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ;' and he believed the time was approaching when in all parts of the earth would prevail the apostolic faith—'There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.'

"In the evening, to a church crammed and overflowing, Mr. Forster, from the words, 'Prove all things—hold fast that which is good'—delivered a most energetic and masterly defence of the Right and Duty of Free Inquiry. Rarely has this hackneyed subject been handled with greater freshness and power. The discourse must have produced a strong impression on the minds of the large audience; nor less, on their hearts, the preacher's feeling, but manly, allusions to himself at its close.

"Mr. Forster announced that he and his friends would meet for public worship in any room in the neighbourhood they could find sufficiently capacious for the purpose, until they were able to erect a suitable building for themselves, towards the cost of which they had already received the promise of liberal aid.

"As an antidote, it is presumed, to Mr. Forster's preaching, a sermon of Robert Hall's, on 'Christ's Pre-existence, Condescension and Exaltation,' was liberally distributed in the evening, as the congregation quitted the church."

The *Morning Advertiser* of June 21st, contained the following notice of Mr. Forster's services of the preceding Sunday:

"*New Religious Movement.*—The Rev. Mr. Forster, of Kentish Town, on Sunday last, delivered two farewell sermons to his congregation; both were of a striking character, and appeared to excite the deep sympathy of large congregations. The church which Mr. Forster now leaves is a very handsome one, and was erected at a cost of about £7000. He has been chiefly instrumental in forming a large congregation, with whom, until lately, he lived on the most cordial terms, and from whom he now voluntarily retires in consequence of his change of views. One of the orthodox doctrines he has seen reason to give up is that of the Trinity, along with other points usually deemed essential by Evangelical Christians. Of the perfect sincerity of Mr. Forster no one who has heard him can entertain a doubt; and he gives proof of it by the pecuniary sacrifice he now makes to his convictions of duty. He and a portion of his late flock intend to form what they call a Free Christian Church, on the basis of the right of private judgment and free inquiry, without any doctrinal test whatever."

To which the Editor of that paper attached these not very gracious comments:

"We insert the above, which has been communicated to us by a correspondent. Mr. Forster, in plain terms, has become a Socinian. This is deeply to be regretted, both on his own account and on that of others. Fortunately, few of the Rev. gentleman's congregation will accompany him to his new place of worship, and, though the novelty of his position may attract a tolerable audience at first, we venture to predict that his congregation will, before the lapse of twelve months, dwindle down to a mere handful. His newly-adopted principles will soon tell on his ministry, which will lose whatever it possessed of warmth and vitality, derived from evangelical apprehension of truth, and will become remarkable only for its coldness and its utter want of spiritual power."

Perilous in modern times is the office of prophet, as no one ought to know better than a newspaper editor, and no editor better than he of the *Advertiser*, who so often indulges in predictions, political and religious, that are never realized. A correspondent (who has favoured us with his communication) addressed to him the following letter, which, it need scarcely be added, has not appeared in his "evangelical" columns:

"*Protestant Popery—Rev. Mr. Forster.*

"Sir,—Is it quite politic or fair in the editor of a newspaper to go out of his way for the purpose of indulging a sneer at the honestly-entertained religious opinions of any portion of his readers? To chronicle an occurrence in the religious world, is one thing; to pronounce not very charitable judgment upon it, is another. Mr. Forster acts the part of an honest, high-minded man; is loyal to conscience, at the sacrifice of what most men hold in highest regard—reputation, old friendships, worldly success; and the sympathy he obtains from you is the nickname 'Socinian,' and the prediction that he will grow 'cold' and lose all 'spiritual power.' Such is modern 'evangelical' Protestantism! By virtue of your Protestant principles, you tell a man it is his right and his duty to search for himself; and if in the exercise of this search to which you direct him, he see reason to depart in the slightest degree from certain conclusions which the Church of England, or some more modern Dissenting 'evangelical' church, has arrived at before him, what is the consequence? Churchman and Evangelical unite in proscribing him—label him with a bad name as his heritage in this world, with the promise of something much worse than a bad name as his heritage in the next! This, remember, simply for the exercise of that which Protestants are always preaching and prating about—the right of free inquiry. Why such Protestantism as this is a delusion and a snare—a caricature of the thing—and only another name for the worst part of Popery. I am to inquire, with a direful doom hanging over me if I honestly follow out the results of my inquiry! And they who thus talk and thus act, pride themselves on their 'evangelical' Protestantism, and some even buckle on shield and armour to go fight against Popery!

"The use of the term 'Socinian' in reference to Mr. Forster and others who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, is scarcely worthy of an intelligent writer of the present day. Between modern Unitarians and the early Socinians there is a broad line of difference, with which any man who presumes to write about them should make himself acquainted. The word is used, probably, because it is offensive to one class and appeals to bad feelings in another.

"That all 'warmth and vitality' of religious feeling is confined to 'evangelical apprehensions of truth,' as you more than insinuate, must strike not a few of your readers as being more akin to 'evangelical' presumption than true Christian humility. Had John Milton no warmth or vitality? Mrs. Barbauld none? Dr. Channing none? If 'warmth and vitality' are exhibited in loud profession and uncharitable judgment, Unitarians may confess themselves 'cold,' in comparison with some religionists; but if the proper exhibition of 'warmth and vitality' be in an enlightened intellect, a kindly heart, and a useful, upright life, then in this world—their opponents being judges—Unitarians may stand as erect as any other class of religious professors—and, not arrogantly, not presumptuously or exclusively, yet humbly and hopefully, trust to the Mercy which all—saint and sinner alike—will need in the world to come.

"Your obedient servant,

"Anti-Sectarian.

"*June* 22, 1853."

We feel assured that the Unitarians of England will hail with unmingled pleasure Mr. Forster's accession to their ranks, and that they will cheerfully give to his friends support and aid. It is most desirable that he should be at liberty to work out in his own way the disinterested and bold experiment he is prepared to make,—that he should be at liberty to retain all the usages and opinions of his former church which he regards as scriptural and expedient. We shall watch with much interest the progress of this attempt to establish a perfectly free Christian church amongst a people educated in an "orthodox" theology. Should it succeed, it will, we trust, encourage others of the Congregational body, in various parts of the kingdom, who are but slightly attached to the popular theology, to free themselves from all sectarian shackles, and preach Christianity, fearlessly and unreservedly, as they themselves receive it. We are much more anxious that this course should be pursued, than that they should connect themselves with congregations avowedly Unitarian, and accustomed to their own hereditary ecclesiastical usages.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE—FINAL EXAMINATION AT MANCHESTER.

This institution was founded in Manchester in the year 1786. The period of its first existence there was seventeen years, during a portion of which the Mathematical chair was filled by the late Dr. Dalton, who was, in fact, brought to Manchester for the purpose of filling this office. The College was removed to York in 1803, and returned to its original site in September, 1840. It is again to undergo a removal,—the new destination being, as our readers are well aware, London, in connection with University College and University Hall. The final examination and farewell meeting took place in the week beginning Monday, June 20th. The Trustees and Visitors in attendance during the week were very numerous, including, in addition to the Professors of the College, Rev. Wm. Turner and Rev. John Kenrick (Visitors), Mark Philips, Esq., R. N. Philips, Esq., S. D. Darbishire, Esq., Samuel Robinson, Esq., J. A. Nicholls, Esq., Jos. Ewart, Esq., Jas. A. Turner, Esq., Edmund Potter, Esq., Rev. J. H. Thom, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. P. Cannon, Rev. J. G. Robberds, Rev. H. Green, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Rev. F. Baker, Joseph Grimshaw, Esq., Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. E. Talbot, Rev. J. Colston, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Rev. Dr. Beard, Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. John Dendy, Rev. J. R. M'Kee, Thomas Johnson, Esq., Rev. G. H. Wells, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Woolley, Rev. W. Whitelegge, Mr. Freestone, Rev. W. H. Herford, Rev. James Taylor, Rev. Edward Higginson, Rev. John Owen, Rev. F. Howorth. — Professor Bowman began by examining the class in Ancient History, and stated that the subjects were threefold, relating to the history of Egypt and the East, Greece, and Rome; that he was enabled to express his satisfaction with the diligence of the class; and that the merits of some members were so equal that he had felt difficulty in awarding the prize. In this and most of the other classes, answers previously prepared without the aid of books or notes, were read aloud by the class.—Professor Finlay then examined the junior class in Mathematics, which had, he stated, given very good answers to a long series of questions in arithmetic and algebra. A portion of them were read, and illustrated by demonstrations on the black board.—Professor Bowman then proceeded to examine the middle and senior Latin classes. A portion of the class, designing to compete for honours at the approaching examination of the University of London for the B.A. degree, had read, in addition to the ordinary work, a selection from the Letters of Cicero, and the Aulularia of Plautus; the whole of the class had read the Odes, Epistles and Ars Poetica of Horace. A satisfactory examination was passed in the two latter books. After a brief interval, during which the guests and students partook of refreshments in one of the libraries, Professor Finlay proceeded to examine the senior class in Natural Philosophy, composed of students in their third year, who, the Professor stated, had been reading the Natural Philosophy required for the B.A. degree. A considerable portion of this they had previously read in their first year, but had revised and enlarged it. Except in astronomy, the answers were very good. The questions comprehended statics, dynamics and hydrostatics, and astronomy.—Professor Gaskell then took the English Language class, stating that, besides giving some attention to the history and formation of the English language, the students had been occupied with exercises each week in English composition. It was greatly to the credit of the class that there had not been a single omission in the preparation of the essays, and on no occasion had he found it necessary to inflict a fine. A very interesting examination ensued, in the history and formation of our language, including a glance at the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic and Mœso-Gothic tongues. Professor Finlay then called up Mr. Henry Turner for an extra Mathematical examination, stating that he had attended an extra class four hours in the week, and had gone through a considerable course of the higher Mathematics (the differential and integral calculus, &c.). Out of thirty questions, some of very great difficulty, twenty-eight had been answered very correctly. The examination quite justified the Professor's commendation. The day's proceedings were brought to a close by Mr. Turner's reading an oration on "The Practice of Impressment for the Navy," which was at its close greeted with applause.

On Tuesday, June 21, the business was resumed by Professor Finlay, with the junior class in Natural Philosophy, which had read an extensive course of statics, dynamics, and hydrostatics; also of optics and acoustics. The answers to the examination paper had

been generally good; in hydrostatics every question had been answered. The middle and senior Greek class followed, and Professor Bowman stated that the class, though examined together, had worked in two divisions. The first, consisting of students reading for the pass B.A. degree, had read the "Prometheus Vinctus" of Æschylus, and the "De Corona" of Demosthenes; the second, consisting of students reading for honours, had in addition to the "De Corona," read also the "Œdipus Tyrannus" of Sophocles, three books of Aristotle's Ethics, and a considerable portion of the "Agamemnon" of Æschylus. The examination was taken in the "De Corona," the book prescribed by the University of London for the B.A. degree this year. Professor Martineau next examined the class in Mental Philosophy. The question paper was long and extremely abstruse; but several of the students gave full and excellent answers. After an interval for refreshments, Professor Bowman took the junior Greek class—composed of first year students, all intending to matriculate in the University of London. They had read the "Odyssey" of Homer, book xi., Xenophon's "Memorabilia," book ii., and the "Apologia" of Plato. Besides translating passages selected at the time, the students gave very satisfactory answers to the questions illustrating the mythology, history, and grammatical peculiarities involved. Professor Finlay examined next the senior class in Mathematics, which had read all the Mathematics necesssary for the pass B.A. examination. The questions in trigonometry, which were difficult, were all answered; the examination paper comprehended also questions in arithmetic and algebra, the straight line and the conic sections. Professor Gaskell then examined the class in English Literature—the questions included a view of Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and early English literature, and that which succeeded, coming down to the period of Addison. The latter questions included the works and literary characteristics of Bishop Hall, Milton, Dryden, Otway, Swift, Pope and Addison. Mr. Whitehead concluded the business of the day by reading an oration on "The Oratory of Greece." Much interest was excited by the intelligence received during the progress of the examination, of the success of a former student of the College, Mr. Addyes Scott, son of Mr. Robert Scott, formerly Member for Walsall, to whom has been awarded the gold medal for the first place in Classics, in the examination for honours for the M.A. degree in the University of London. This is the fourth gold medal awarded by the University to Manchester College students; Messrs. Tayler and Hutton having obtained it in the department of Mental Philosophy, and Mr. Roberts in that of Mathematics.

The examination was resumed on Wednesday with the junior Latin class. Professor Bowman stated that all the class, excepting one, were preparing for the matriculation examination. The books read were Livy, one book of the Odes of Horace, and Cicero's Oration for the Manilian Law. The examination was taken in Livy.—A very interesting examination ensued in Moral Philosophy, by Professor Martineau. The question paper contained twenty principal questions,—most of them branching into a series of subordinate questions. The answers were generally able and interesting. It may interest our readers to see some of the questions selected from this paper:

7. Enumerate the three principal arguments in favour of the scheme of Necessity, and the replies which have been given to them. Show that the doctrine of human liberty is not inconsistent with a perfect system of Providence.

8. Illustrate the maxim, "Nullus in microcosmo Spiritus, nullus in macrocosmo Deus;" and show that, without the postulate of Free-will in man, Theism loses its foundation.

9. In what relation does the system of Pantheism stand to the doctrine of Moral Obligation? From what tendency of mind does it take its origin, and to what mode of thought does it most oppose itself? What was the Hylo-zoism of Strato? and how distinguished from the Eleatic doctrine? Give some account of Xenophanes and his principles.

10. Who is the founder of the modern Pantheism? Whence did he derive its fundamental thought? In what relation did it stand to his hereditary faith? and to the prevailing sentiments of his age? What was the history of his chief works?

11. Under what heads do the definitions and axioms of Spinoza reduce all the objects of human thought? What was his notion of *Substance?* and where must we look for its analogue in the Greek Philosophy? How does he exclude *plurality* from Substance? and *finiteness?* In what sense, and on what grounds, does he affirm God to be a *Free Cause?* and deny

Him to be either a *voluntary* or an *intellectual* Cause? How is this denial to be reconciled with his ascription to God of both *activity* and *thought*?

12. What was the scope of the word "*Nature*," as used by Spinoza? and what distinction did he mark within it? What two ways are there of identifying the Universe and God? and which of these did Spinoza take? How does Hegel defend him from the charge of Atheism?

13. Sketch the leading features of Spinoza's Psychology and Ethics. Show that they do not fulfil the conditions of a true moral theory. Point out the fallacious assumptions on which his whole system rests.

14. Who was the founder of the modern school of Nominalists in Psychology, and Utilitarians in Morals? In what part of his doctrine have they receded from him? and in what respects have they strengthened his exposition? What origin does the "Leviathan" assign to all voluntary actions? What account does it give of the primary human rights? of the nature of Justice and Injustice? of the foundation of the Moral Virtues? Explain the connection between his philosophical principles and his political creed?

15. Illustrate by some instances, the character of Hobbes's psychological analysis; and compare it with the more refined method by which his modern admirers obtain similar results. To what causes may his great influence be attributed?

16. When first, in addition to theological resistance, did a successful philosophical reaction take place against the doctrines of Hobbes? What social and ecclesiastical conditions favoured this change? Describe the school, and the person that represented and led the reaction.

Mr. Edwin Smith read an oration on "The Connection between Knowledge and Virtue."

The hour for the close of the examination in the Literary and Scientific department had now arrived. The Common Hall presented a very animated appearance, all the seats being occupied by the students and friends of the College. The venerable William Turner was in the room, and represented, as the sole survivor, the Warrington Academy, out of which Manchester College may be said to have sprung. Had Mr. Wellbeloved's state of health permitted him to attend, the Hackney College would have been represented. A melancholy feeling stole over the minds of many of the friends present, when they remembered that the venerable man who had through such a long series of years represented at the annual examinations the academical institutions at Daventry and Hackney, the late Rev. John Kentish, would never again cheer by his approving presence the labours of professors and students. Of the original Manchester Academy, a lay representative attended in the person of J. Grimshaw, Esq. (J.P.), of Gorton, and a divine in Rev. W. Whitelegge. In the absence of Robt. Philips, Esq., of Heybridge, the President, the chair was taken by Mark Philips, Esq. It was his pleasing task first of all to close a remarkably satisfactory examination by distributing the prizes to the successful competitors, and he read the award of the Professors in the following words:

"In the class of Ancient History, in consequence of the nearly uniform merit of four students, there has been considerable difficulty in awarding the prize, and, on the recommendation of the Professor, two prizes have been granted instead of one. The first has been awarded to Mr. Holland,* the second to Mr. Grimshaw;† but it is due to Mr. Wood and Mr. Blazeby to state that their attention and progress throughout the session have been little, if at all, inferior to those of their two competitors. Mr. Arthur Aspland has also been diligent and attentive. Mr. Holland —Schmitz's Histories of Greece and Rome, 2 vols. Mr. Grimshaw—Blair's Chronology enlarged, 1 vol.

"In junior Classics, the application and progress of the same students has been throughout satisfactory. The result of the periodical examinations during the session gives, by a small difference in the number of marks, the first place to Mr. Blazeby and the second to Mr. Wood, and to these students, therefore, the two prizes are awarded. Mr. Grimshaw and Mr. Holland are both entitled to high commendation for uniform diligence and steady progress made. Mr. Blazeby—Corpus Poetarum Latinorum. Mr. Wood —Sophocles and Æschylus, by Dindorf, 2 vols.

"In middle Classics, the highest place has been attained by Mr. Whitehead;‡ but as he has already on a previous occasion received the prize of this class, it is now deservedly awarded to Mr. Edwin

* Son of the Rev. T. C. Holland, of Loughborough and Mount Sorrel.

† Son of Mr. Grimshaw, of Gorton.

‡ Son of Rev. James Whitehead, of Ainsworth, near Bury.

Smith. Mr. Smith—Browne's History of Greek Literature, 2 vols.

"In the junior Mathematical class, equal prizes have been awarded to Mr. Wood and Mr. Grimshaw. Mr. Wood—Gregory's Solid Geometry, Salmon's Conic Sections, and Hymer's Algebraic Equations. Mr. Grimshaw—Grant's Astronomy, Ohm's Differences and Series, and Lacroix on Probability.

"In the class of English Language, the Professor has had some difficulty in awarding the prize; but on the whole, the answers of Mr. Wood were the most full and correct, and to him therefore it is given.

"In the class of Mental Philosophy, the Professor has also had difficulty in making his award; but while desirous of mentioning with praise the answers of Mr. Whitehead (the only other student who could compete), he has awarded the prize to Mr. Edwin Smith.* Mr. Smith—Sir William Hamilton's edition of Reid's Works, and Sir William Hamilton's Discussions in Philosophy, Literature and Education."

As the name of each prize-man was named, he proceeded to the dais of the President and Professors, amid the applause of his companions in study and friends, and received the awarded books.

After a momentary pause, Mr. Philips proceeded to say, that he felt some embarrassment in performing the duty that now devolved on him. Until he entered the room, he did not know what was expected from him. There was, however, something peculiar in the character of their present meeting,—the last which would be held in that room,—the College being on the eve of a removal to a distant scene. There was, he doubted not, a deep and anxious feeling in the minds of many of the friends around him. They were about to take a very important step in relation to the future prosperity of the College. Although the decision to make the change had been sanctioned by a large majority, not the boldest and most sanguine amongst them could say that the intended change could command all the success they desired. A great deal had to be done—a great weight of responsibility rested on all the friends of the College. He was anxious to impress upon them, that though the institution was about to change its locality, it would lose not one single claim upon their affectionate interest and zealous support. He hoped that students and professors, trustees, subscribers and the ministers of our congregations throughout the kingdom, would all feel that they had a great work to do,—that unanimity of purpose and action would carry them through a great many difficulties. His hopes and aspirations were for improvement and progress. He would not say he was sanguine of success; but of one thing he was certain, that success could not be obtained without united action. He could not on such an occasion abstain from expressing the strong feeling he entertained of the great weight of obligation which they owed to those gentlemen to whom they now sorrowfully felt they were about to bid adieu, the Professors in the Literary and Scientific department. For himself and the Trustees generally, he might be permitted to say, that all cordially thanked them for their services. They had, he regretted to think, been ill rewarded, as far as pecuniary rewards were concerned; but they might be assured there was no poverty of feeling in the appreciation of their labours. Though now about to bid adieu to those gentlemen in their official character as Professors, they should continue to feel the greatest interest in their personal welfare, and wish them success in other walks of usefulness and distinction, in all their future years. He could not but feel that the occasion of their meeting was in some respects solemn and painful. It was, in fact, a leave-taking and a bidding adieu to some who had held most important positions in, and rendered most efficient services to, the College; and in respect to whom, during the continuance of those services, the only feeling was of regret that the sphere of their labours had such narrow limits. To the students who were about to quit the institution, he would say, that he trusted they would cherish kind and friendly associations of feeling with their Alma Mater. He could fancy, from his own experience and the recollection of his visits to the College in another district, that they would cast many a fond and lingering look on their College—that in future years they would not pass through this metropolis of industry and manufacturing skill, without paying a visit to the scene of their academic life—that they would habitually look back on the period of their studentship with feelings of pleasure, and remember to the close of their lives with satisfaction the personal and literary associations they had here

* Son of Rev. — Smith, of Doncaster.

formed. With respect to the future of their institution, he must say that nothing was nearer to his heart than its success in its intended locality. He trusted that experience would dissipate the anticipations of those who feared that the change would diminish the united zeal and action of their religious body. Whatever differences of opinion had existed amongst them, he trusted would be buried in oblivion, and that there would be on all hands a cordial and united effort to secure to the College the largest amount of success. To the students who would remove to London, he would say, that the change could not but open to them a wide and noble field of competition, of which he hoped they would make good use. They would henceforth carry on their literary and scientific studies in company with a much larger number than hitherto of persons engaged in the same pursuits. While, on the one hand, they would not be exposed to the danger of undue self-estimation, he trusted they would allow no bitterness to infuse itself in the fair and open struggle for honours. There might be in such a competition a kind and harmonious feeling. The excitement of the struggle would benefit them. This was an age in which men could not be suffered to stand still. To stand still was, in fact, to go back. There were advantages offered to the students of University College — instruction of the best kind in departments which a few years ago were little cultivated. He would conclude, then, by the earnest advice to them to enter on their studies in London with the determination to make a faithful use of their great advantages, and to honour their profession as students, and the institution of which they were members, by a resolute devotion of all their time and their noblest powers to their studies.

Mr. Robert N. Philips, as Chairman of the Committee, stated that a resolution had been passed by the Committee, a copy of which had been forwarded to all the Professors. It was thought, however, desirable by the Committee, and a proper token of respect to the gentlemen concerned, that it should be read aloud on so remarkable an occasion as the present, as an expression of the feelings entertained towards the Professors. He and his colleagues had felt no slight regret that the occasion for bidding adieu to such valued friends had arisen. But it must be borne in mind that, even if the College had remained in Manchester, it would have ceased to be an integral institution; for there prevailed amongst the Trustees an almost unanimous persuasion that the time was come when for literary and scientific instruction their institution must cease to depend on its own resources. This was his consolation in the hour of parting, that the vote for the removal to London was not the cause of a separation which all felt to be painful, but which all knew to be inevitable. Mr. Philips than read the resolution in these terms :

"That in pursuance of the resolution of the Trustees at their Special Meeting held Dec. 8, 1852, formal notices be given to the Professors of the College of the termination of their services at the close of the Session. That, in communicating with the Professors, the Chairman of the Committee be requested to assure them that in fulfilling the instructions of the Trustees in this matter, the Committee entertain a strong sense of the untiring zeal and admirable ability with which the Professors have discharged their duty to the College, often under circumstances far from encouraging, and the great regret felt by the Committee at the prospect of the termination of duties so well fulfilled, and a connection on which they look back with satisfaction and pride."

Rev. R. Brook Aspland being called upon, said that it devolved upon him, as one of the Secretaries of the College, to read a document which had been that day placed on the minutes of the Committee, and which that body thought was a suitable appendix to the resolution just read, acknowledging the eminent ability and zeal of the Professors. It was a list of the students of Manchester New College who had, since its removal from York, obtained honours in the University of London. It did not contain the names of the graduates (though that would be an honourable list), but only of those who had obtained what were technically called honours. The list was chronologically arranged.

1841. Mr. Philip Carpenter and Mr. G. V. Smith—a prize for an examination in the Text of the Old and New Testament and in Scripture History.
— Mr. Russell Scott matriculated with honours in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.
1844. Mr. Robert Halley, ditto.
1845. Mr. Samuel Roberts matriculated with honours in both Mathematics and Classics.

1845. Mr. C. Beard and Mr. J. H. Tayler matriculated with honours in Classics.
1846. Mr. A. W. Worthington, matriculated with honours in Classics.
1847. Mr. Samuel Roberts graduated B.A. with honours in Mathematics.
— Mr. J. H. Tayler bracketed for the first place in the B.A. examination in Classics, with honours.
— Mr. Chas. Beard, B.A., in Classics, with honours.
1848. Mr. Addyes Scott matriculated with honours in Classics, and obtained a scholarship for three years.
— Mr. W. A. Darbishire and Mr. Alfred Worthington graduated B. A. with honours.
1849. Mr. Samuel Roberts on graduating M.A., obtained the gold medal for Mathematics.
— Mr. R. H. Hutton graduated M.A., and obtained the gold medal in Logic, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy.
1850. Mr. J. H. Tayler graduated M.A. in the same department, and also obtained the gold medal.
1851. Mr. Addyes Scott graduated B.A. with honours in both Classics and Mathematics, and in the former branch obtained a second scholarship.
— Mr. H. Turner matriculated with honours in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.
— Mr. J. T. Whitehead matriculated with honours in Classics.
1852. Mr. J. H. Tayler bracketed for a scholarship on graduating LL.B., and also for the first place in an examination on the Principles of Legislation.
— Mr. H. S. Boult matriculated with honours in both Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.

These names were recorded in the London University Calendar (which, it is fair to state, divides the honours of Messrs. Tayler, Hutton and Scott between Manchester and University Colleges); but through private intelligence he was enabled to complete this honourable list by the name of Mr. Addyes Scott, who has just added to his previous University successes the gold medal on graduating M.A. in Classics.

This list of honours bore, in the opinion of the Committee, the best possible testimony to the high character of the instructions communicated by the Professors of Manchester New College. In every department in which it was possible for the University of London to affix its stamp to their labours—in the three departments—it had been done by two gold medals in Philosophy, one in Mathematics, and now another in Classics. Every honour obtained by their pupils was reflected on the Professors, by whose instructions they had been prepared for the noble contest.

Professor Bowman, on behalf of himself and his colleagues of the Literary and Scientific department, acknowledged the kind and flattering appreciation of their services contained in the resolution read by the Chairman of the Committee, and in the remarks of the Vice-President. He was confident that he spoke the sentiments of his colleagues when he said, that they all felt deeply grateful for these testimonies to their services, for which, indeed, their approbation was the greatest present reward they could obtain. He, for his own part, could say that he had not participated in the feelings to which allusion had been made, either of dissatisfaction at the smallness of his remuneration or discouragement at the limited numbers of his classes. The work they had committed to him had been one of deep interest, and their service one of which he had been proud, irrespective either of numbers or emolument; and he should look back on the seven years he had spent as their Classical Professor as perhaps the happiest period of his life. It was natural that some feelings of sorrow should force themselves on him at the reflection that this connection was now to cease, and an office to be taken from him which had afforded him so delightful a field of occupation. But for his own sake he could cheerfully accept their decision, painful as were the feelings with which he regarded it. What to him was more painful was, that these feelings were not relieved by any conviction that to the College itself the meditated change would be attended with a single clear advantage that could compensate for the sacrifice involved in a removal. He did not wish to re-open a question that was now to be considered as closed, but he might perhaps, considering the circumstances under which he spoke, be pardoned for expressing at least his regret that such had been the decision of the Trustees. He had listened to the gratifying catalogue of honours won by their students, and he saw that the Literary and Scientific department of their College had placed it in a position of which any of the affiliated Colleges might be proud, and which scarcely one of them, considering their comparative numbers, had attained. He could not but express his surprise that the

Trustees should feel dissatisfaction at this department, and confessed himself totally unable to understand what it was that was prompting them to get rid of what had, both in its intention and results, done them credit, and maintained for their institution a position of no small distinction among the Dissenting Colleges of the country. He could not help regarding the step they were taking as a lowering of the Unitarian body in the eyes of England. He deeply regretted that the Trustees should have deliberately determined to step down from their honourable position by making their College an appendage of a younger College which ranks no higher than their own, and placing themselves in complete dependence upon classes which furnish a shorter course, and over which they could exercise no control. Mr. Bowman concluded by expressing his undiminished interest in the College, and his cordial wishes for its welfare, wherever it might hereafter be placed.

In the afternoon the Theological examination commenced, and began with a series of extracts read by the students in Rev. J. J. Tayler's class of Ecclesiastical History, from Minucius Felix. The Rev. G. V. Smith took the junior Hebrew class, which had been reading with him since Christmas in the book of Genesis, and was reported to have made considerable progress in Hebrew. A very interesting examination was then conducted by Rev. J. J. Tayler in the ecclesiastical history of the first three centuries. The answers were full, and if not always sanctioned in every particular by the judgment of the Professor, elicited his approbation, as evidencing the reading and independent thought of the students. The proceedings of the afternoon were brought to a close by an oration from Mr. Gow, "on the a-priori Argument for the Being of a God." At an early hour on Thursday morning, June 23rd, Rev. G. V. Smith renewed the examination with the class in the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion. The questions were numerous and searching, and were answered fully and ably. Rev. J. J. Tayler examined the class in Doctrinal and Practical Theology, which had been occupied during the session in the consideration of that division of the entire course which related to "Principles." The last class taken was that of senior Hebrew, which had been engaged in reading the Minor Prophets and the book of Lamentations. The examination was confined to the latter book, and gave evidence of careful preparation and accurate knowledge on the part of the class. Mr. Jones read the last oration, on "the Distinction between the Prophetic and the Scientific Spirit."

After a brief pause, during which some ladies entered the hall, the Rev. John Kenrick delivered an admirable address, of which we have been enabled to present an accurate report in another part of the Magazine. It was followed by a prayer, uttered with emotion and heard with a stillness that was solemn and affecting; and then, with sorrowing countenances, the friends who had so often assembled on that familiar ground, and who felt that in all probability that pleasure would never be renewed, shook hands and parted.

On the following day, an unusually large meeting of Trustees assembled in the Common Hall to transact the usual business, and to take into consideration a resolution of which notice had been previously given by Rev. John Kenrick and Rev. William Gaskell. That resolution was in these words: "That it be recommended to the Committee of the College, to appoint the Rev. George Vance Smith, B.A., to the office of Professor of Critical and Exegetical Theology, the Evidences of Religion, and the Hebrew Language."

After a long discussion, it was put and carried by an overwhelming majority. Immediately afterwards the Committee assembled, and appointed Mr. G. V. Smith as the second Theological Professor in Manchester New College, London.

CHRISTIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

This unpretending but very useful Society held its forty-fourth annual meeting at the office, 178, Strand, on Thursday, May 19th. The chair was taken by the Treasurer, James Esdaile, Esq. The Committee stated in their report that during the past year they had added to their Catalogue seven new tracts, chiefly from the pens of those whose works had previously proved acceptable to the supporters of the Society. Two tracts from other sources had also been added, viz., "The Howards and the Astleys," by Mrs. Edmund Kell, and "Edward Kneller's Deathbed." The change made last year in the agency, although not yet followed by any additional success, will, they trust, prove for the advantage of the Society. Grants of tracts had been made during the year to Birmingham and Belfast. A donation of £20 (one of several gifts from the same quarter)

was announced from Mrs. Burkitt, of Hackney. The expenditure for the year was £103. 0*s.* 11*d.*, while the receipts have been £107. 14*s.* 4*d.*; but there were outstanding liabilities of upwards of £70. A discussion took place respecting the re-publication of the original six volumes of tracts published by the Society, and the Committee was strongly urged to do it by several persons who attended the meeting. We desire to add our recommendation of this project. From intimate acquaintance with the works issued by the Society, we are enabled to state that they have been extensively useful in diffusing amongst the young and the poor good moral principles based on Christian motives. The stories are many of them deeply interesting, but in all of them the amusement of the reader is made the instrument of sound moral instruction. We once heard a good lady, indeed, object to this series, on the ground of the interesting character of the tales—"they were too like little novels." Our answer was, unless she could point out an instance of false or defective moral instruction, her criticism was the best praise that could be given. Popular tracts ought never to be insipid and prosy. We cannot but think, if the wants of this Society and the character of its publications were more generally known, it would receive from the friends of Domestic Missions, the conductors of Sunday-schools, and the promoters of libraries in the servants' hall, a greatly increased amount of support.—We have looked through the new tracts, and find them well adapted for popular use. *It is not worth while*, teaches the importance of industry to domestic comfort, and of doing the right thing at the right time. *Philip Scobell* teaches a lesson of honesty and frugality. *Uncle Hartley, or a new Life in Australia*, is by the author of "Village Doings," who here impresses on humble readers the importance of all the members of a family, but especially mothers, making home happy. "Rachel's Story," amongst other useful lessons, teaches that good may be brought out of apparent evil. *Patty Green, or the Story of a Loving Heart*, describes itself. The valuable and popular series of tracts entitled *Ann Farley's Visits to her Neighbours*, is completed by the publication of a sixth part, and the whole series forms a volume, which will, we venture to predict, have as large a circulation as any of the Society's previous volumes. *Dead Flies*, by Mr. Thomas Bowring, one of the Fire-side Missionary series, points out the damage to character and usefulness by the faults and follies of the wise and good.

Services at the Old Presbyterian Chapel, Hall Bank, Buxton, 1853.

July 3. Rev. Wm. Sutherland, Flagg.
— 10. Rev. M. C. Frankland, Chowbent.
— 17. Rev. Y. G. Teggin, Mansfield.
— 24. Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Belper.
— 31. Rev. T. Hincks, A.M., Sheffield.
Aug. 7. Rev. George Lee, Kendal.
— 14. Rev. F. Howorth, Bury.
— 21. Rev. T. Hunter, Chesterfield.
— 28. Rev. Edward Hawkes, A.M., Kendal.
Sept. 4. Rev. Chas. W. Robberds, Sidmouth.
— 11. Rev. Chas. Wallace, A.M., Altrincham.
— 18. Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., Manchester.
— 25. Rev. Vance Smith, A.M., ditto.

Morning service at eleven o'clock.
Evening service at half-past six.

UNIVERSITY HALL.

The annual general meeting of the members and friends of University Hall will be held on Thursday, the 7th of July, at three o'clock P.M., Mark Philips, Esq., in the chair; and a dinner will take place in the Hall at half-past five. The Trustees of the Hibbert Fund are expected to join the party. The charge for dinner, including wine, will be ten shillings and sixpence. Those members and friends who purpose to attend the dinner will greatly oblige by signifying their intention to "The Chairman of the Committee, University Hall, Gordon Square."

Rev. EDMUND KELL will shortly remove from Newport, where he has discharged the pastoral office with eminent zeal for thirty years, to undertake the pastoral charge at Southampton.